

PROPERTY OF
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
THE
DEC 12 1956

SC

DECEMBER 1956

RECEIVED
**CLASSICAL
JOURNAL**

The Classics Take the Air

G. Robert Holsinger 97

Catullus 2

Roy A. Swanson 99

THE FORUM

Margaret M. Forbes 100

How Did Augustus Stop the Roman Revolution?

Chester G. Starr 107

The Structure of Horace's *Odes*:

Some Typical Patterns

Janice M. Cordray 113

Martial 6. 35

Martha C. Heath 116

Lupus in Fabula

Kenneth M. Abbott 117

NOTES

Parallels in Juvenal and Housman

Tom Burns Haber 123

Seneca and the "New Insight"

Robert J. Leslie 125

The Structure of Nepos' Lives

Paul R. Murphy 125

of Miltiades and Themistocles

William C. Korfmacher 128

***A Verbum Sesquipedale* and the Grammarians**

WE SEE BY THE PAPERS

Graves H. Thompson 129

Palaephatus—Pragmatic Mythographer

George F. Osmun 131

Catullus 3

Roy A. Swanson 137

BOOK REVIEWS

Fred W. Householder, Jr. 138

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-Chief: NORMAN T. PRATT, JR., Indiana University.

For the Atlantic States: FRANKLIN B. KRAUSS, Pennsylvania State University.

For New England: JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS, Trinity College.

For the Pacific States: W. M. GREEN, University of California.

Book Reviews: FRED W. HOUSEHOLDER, JR., Indiana University.

The Forum: MARGARET M. FORBES, University of Minnesota.

We See by the Papers: GRAVES THOMPSON, Hampden-Sydney College.

Classical Articles in Non-Classical Periodicals: WILLIAM C. GRUMMEL, University of Washington.

BUSINESS STAFF

Managing Editor: D. HERBERT ABEL, Loyola University, 820 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago.

Circulation Manager: JOHN N. HOUGH, 8E Hellems Bldg., University of Colorado, Boulder.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

The general subscription price is \$3.75 (USA), \$4.00 (foreign). Single copies 60c (USA), 65c (foreign); subscriptions for less than a year at the single copy rate. Teachers and other interested individuals may subscribe through one of the regional associations below, annual membership-subscription rate, \$3.75. Members may subscribe also to the *CLASSICAL OUTLOOK* and *CLASSICAL WEEKLY*; for rates consult the regional secretary-treasurer. Members of CAMWS and CAAS have the option of receiving either the *CLASSICAL JOURNAL* or *CLASSICAL WEEKLY* (published by CAAS).

MEMBERSHIPS

Address the secretary-treasurer of the appropriate regional association. CAMWS, JOHN N. HOUGH, 8E Hellems Bldg., University of Colorado, Boulder; CANE, CONSTANTINE G. YAVIS, Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass.; CAAS, F. GORDON STOCKIN, Houghton College, Houghton, N.Y.; CAPS (Northern), MISS GAIL INGLE, 4754 16th St. N.E., Seattle, Wash. (Central), E. Y. LINDSAY, Grant Union H.S., Del Paso Heights, Calif. (Southern), MRS. FRANCES T. CHAMPION, Chadwick School, Rolling Hills, Calif.

CORRESPONDENCE

Address all general editorial correspondence, MSS, etc. to NORMAN T. PRATT, JR., Indiana University, Bloomington; departmental materials to the proper editors listed above; MSS from the Atlantic, New England, and Pacific states to the regional editors above; concerning subscriptions and details of circulation to Sec.-Treas. JOHN N. HOUGH, 8E Hellems Bldg., University of Colorado, Boulder; on advertising and other business items to Prof. ABEL.

THE *CLASSICAL JOURNAL* is published by the *Classical Association of the Middle West and South Inc.*, with the cooperation of the *Classical Association of New England*, the *Classical Association of the Pacific States*, and the *Classical Association of the Atlantic States*. The annual volume consists of eight issues (October through May). Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Boulder, Colo., with an additional entry at Wilmette, Ill., on September 14, 1953. Entered under Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on October 19, 1952.

Printed by Lloyd Hollister Inc.,
Wilmette, Illinois. U.S.A.

REMINDER

The Fifty-Third Annual Meeting
of the Classical Association
of the Middle West and South
will be at Columbus, Ohio,
April 18-20, 1957.

CANE, 1956-57

Pres. Barbara McCarthy, Wellesley College.
Vice-Pres. Allan S. Hoey, Hotchkiss Sch.,
Lakeville, Conn.

Sec.-Treas. Constantine G. Yavis, Holy
Cross College.

Additional members, Exec. Com.: Miss
Grace Crawford; Dr. Herrick Macomber,
Phillips Exeter Academy; Miss Edith S.
Pitt, Portland (Me.) High School; Prof. C.
Arthur Lynch, Brown University.

The 51st Annual Meeting of CANE will be
held at Wesleyan University, Middle-
town, Conn., April 5-6, 1957.

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

Volume 52 Number 3

DECEMBER 1956

The Classics Take the Air

G. ROBERT HOLSINGER

IT SEEMS RATHER EVIDENT from all one can read and hear today that teachers and scholars have a sort of innate distrust for the mass media as channels of really useful information. Everywhere one hears that television, in particular, is not only ruining the eyesight of our younger generation, but also their minds, and is stifling every natural desire for good books and thought-provoking conversation.

As a classicist, now principally working in educational television, I refuse to concede that this is true. I firmly believe that radio and television (let us exclude newspapers and magazines here as meat for another article) can and do play a very significant role as educational forces, and I am sure that we as classicists have not even begun to take full advantage of their potentialities. To illustrate, I would like to summarize our experiences at The Ohio State University along with some of the exciting national developments, and to offer suggestions for more profitable use of our broadcasting channels by local school systems and smaller colleges and universities.

The broadcasting story at Ohio State really begins four years ago, when radio was occupying most of my time and educational television in the city of Columbus was still very much in the stages of preliminary planning. I found upon examination of past program schedules that WOSU-Radio had

never broadcast a series devoted to classical literature. We had courses in the Romance languages, programs devoted to English literature, a series treating geology in all of its aspects, but absolutely nothing in the area of classical antiquity. This to a classicist was manifestly not only a challenge, but a red flag.

In the spring of 1952, I went to my colleagues in the Department of Classical Languages and laid before them a proposal for a series of programs, *Readings in Classical Literature*, to be broadcast for one half-hour three times each week. After a series of conferences, we decided to go ahead, even though we had begun to know by this time the feelings of Wilbur and Orville Wright when their critics said, "It'll never fly."

I am happy to report that *Readings in Classical Literature*, like the first flying machine, did fly and, indeed, is still flying high. From its inception the series has been conducted by Professors Kenneth Abbott and Robert Jones of our classical language department, and has included such topics as the ancient historians, Homer, Greek tragedy, Cicero, the Greek lyric poets, and even Apuleius. Our intent has been not to teach the literature, but to read and discuss it, and the results have been gratifying indeed. *Readings* is now one of the most popular of the WOSU programs, and we

rarely get a listener-letter which doesn't mention the program as "must" listening.

Since I would like in this article to direct your attention primarily to television, that evil little black box, the preceding remarks are given mainly as background for what came later when WOSU-TV first began to telecast in February of this year. Heartened by our success in radio and still burning with a missionary zeal for the Classics, we began to plan almost immediately a television series, ultimately called *The Ancient World*.

Television, as anyone who has ever been involved in it knows, is tremendously time-consuming, and a television series requires many more hours of planning, research, and rehearsal than does a similar series on radio. Thus, we reasoned, it would not be feasible to ask one or two faculty members to take on such a heavy burden. Why not then draw upon the resources of all the university departments which were in any way concerned with our heritage from ancient Greece and Rome? Acting as producer of the series, I finally developed with the enthusiastic assistance of classical and other colleagues a series of nine telecasts. The variety of the programs can best be illustrated by listing the topics covered and the departments contributing (Classical Languages, if not specified): "Caesar as a Writer"; "The Excavations at Pompeii"; "Archeological Chemistry" (Chemistry); "The Philosophy of Plato" (Philosophy); "Greek Athletics"; "Roman Law" (History); and "The Ancient Book." The concluding telecast presented a reading of scenes from the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus. All of these programs were given before a specially designed studio set consisting of white classical figures against a black background.

Once again, the response was encouraging, and one viewer was prompted to write: "Please do another series of this kind. You will be happy to know that I plan to raid the Classics section of

our local library for more material." We are investigating at the present time the possibilities of a more concentrated series of telecasts on some aspect of the Classics, perhaps with Ford Foundation help for released faculty time.

We cannot end our survey of television activity without at least a brief look at what is being done on a national scale in educational television. We must say also that the Educational Television and Radio Center at Ann Arbor, Michigan, the center for all educational television activity in the United States, is well aware of the appeal of the ancient world. Two new series will be released to the educational television network (a network joined via kinescope and film) within the next few months. One, produced at New York University under the title of *Yesterday's Worlds*, deals primarily with archeology; this series originally had phenomenal success when produced on WCBSTV in New York on Saturday afternoons. These programs were prepared and presented by Professor Casper Kraemer of NYU's Classics department, and produced for the public affairs department of WCBSTV.

Of particular interest, also, is another series of three half-hour programs to be released shortly to educational television stations: the production of the *Oresteia*, done in the original Greek at Randolph-Macon Woman's College. The Center has called this a great "first" in the Classics and for educational television. The commentary, of course, is in English, and original background music was written by Dr. Henry Hallstrom and played by the National Symphony Orchestra.

Now, however, lest I be accused of saying "Look what we've done," I would like to state my basic thesis. The foregoing examples are just that: samples of what can be done and what has been done by classicists interested in the possibilities of radio and television as a means of disseminating classical culture and quickening public in-

terest in our pet subjects. I submit that the same sort of broadcasting and telecasting activities (perhaps, even more imaginative ones) can be carried on by teachers of the Classics in their own communities. Our broadcasting channels, as defined under the regulations of the Federal Communications Commission, belong to *the people* of the communities served by these channels. The broadcasters do not *own* the channels, they *use* them by permission of the citizens as represented by the FCC. This means, among other things, that broadcasters have a duty to present public service programs and to operate "in the public interest, convenience, and necessity."

I do not mean to imply that broadcasters are attempting to dodge this responsibility. As a matter of fact, the situation is quite the opposite. Most stations will be happy to cooperate with local Latin clubs in the presentation of Latin Week programs, for example; and if a local society goes to a broadcaster with a well-reasoned series of programs in mind, again cooperation will be forthcoming, even to the extent of giving assistance in production. Accepting my minor premise that classicists are people (*quis negat?*), the broadcasting channels are for classicists too and ought willingly to serve their interests, among which is the wider dissemination of classical learning.

Let us face the facts of life. Good public relations will not harm the Classics. For too long we have been content to hide our light under a bushel, some of us perhaps even agreeing with our critics who say that the Classics are only for a few select "egg-heads." One of our WOSU listeners recently wrote: "I never realized that the Classics played such an important role in the development of modern thought. Be assured that my children will be encouraged to sample some of the classical courses which were denied to me by an emphasis on technical education." Encouraged by comments

such as these, let us use the media at hand to bring about an awareness of the Classics among listeners and viewers, instead of gazing down from an ivory tower with indiscriminate condemnation on the media which have become such an integral part of modern life.

The Ohio State University

Catullus 2

Little sparrow, my lover's love,
with whom she plays, permits to lie
within her lap to nip her finger,
biting quickly with that bill,
when my shining light of love
is pleased to play some little game
to lend her care some tender ease —
her fervor then, I'm sure, must cease—:
I should like to play with you
as she, and soothe my troubled heart!

ROY A. SWANSON

Indiana University

Interpretation

TRAVEL with distinguished
American Scholars.

STUDY "on location" these
great civilizations.

ENGLAND, GERMANY,
FRANCE, SWITZERLAND,
AUSTRIA, PORTUGAL,
SPAIN, THE BALEARICS,
DALMATIAN COAST,
ITALY, GREECE and
SCANDINAVIA also
SOUTH AMERICA.

TRAVEL in SPRING
SUMMER or FALL.

Write for information to the

BUREAU OF UNIVERSITY TRAVEL

11-d Boyd Street, Newton, Mass.

THE FORUM

MARGARET M. FORBES, EDITOR

If readers find items in this department provocative or even irritating, letters to its editor are welcome and also will be considered for publication here if the correspondent so desires.

A LAYMAN LOOKS AT LATIN

MR. JOSEPH SAGMASTER, the distinguished editor of the Cincinnati *Times-Star*, added a new dimension to the CAMWS meeting at Lexington.

He cited three reasons for a layman to be interested in preserving or restoring Latin: "Its potential economic value, its actual and generally neglected aesthetic value, and its value as training for the young mind.

"A knowledge of Latin has obvious value to anyone whose job involves, in any way, the use of words. Consider the 'Great Secretarial Problem' in the United States today. Busy, harassed executives spend hours of exasperation every day trying to cope with the errors of secretaries and stenographers who cannot write an intelligent English sentence, seem never to have heard of grammar, and cannot spell." If, as seems to be the case, some executives are little better equipped, then "these two problems collide in the same office, and the result is the sort of grammatical curiosities occasionally turning up in my mail, and I'm sure in yours. Surely the Latin student has a head start in mastering the basic principles of grammar—English grammar. . . . That is something for our personnel directors in business and industry to keep in mind."

Again "a more urgent need for Latin should be felt by the public speaker, especially in politics, who must speak often and extemporaneously. Why is it that the written or spoken word in Great Britain is so often superior to ours here in the United States? . . . I've spent hours in the British House of Commons and many more in our own houses of Congress, listening to speeches and debates. The transatlantic comparison is not favorable to our side. I am convinced that the main reason for the British superiority lies in the advantage of the discipline of classical studies over a number of years. They have had a solid grounding in Latin—and usually Greek as well—for their command of English."

As for the aesthetic argument for Latin, rarely heard outside academic circles, this is an unfortunate, and even a strange lack in educated Americans, "a nation whose culture resembles in so many ways—not all of them reassuring—that of the Roman empire. Many millions miss throughout their lives not only the pleasure of reading Virgil and Ovid in the original . . . but also the peculiar appeal of the great Roman satirists like Juvenal to our time, which is essentially an Age of Satire."

But "Latin demands too many years of concentrated study from a generation accustomed to being entertained in a passive mood and a sedentary posture, with no more output of energy than is required to turn a dial. Besides, from my own limited observation, it is only the exceptional student of Latin who, when he finally lays aside his textbooks, has any clear notion of what Virgil, for example, is all about. And here, I'm afraid, is a real defect in our usual methods of teaching Latin. . . . I wish I could believe that the fault lies in the student, or even in an individual teacher. I suspect that the trouble lies deeper—in neglect of the aesthetic side of Latin study, or, more broadly, in neglect of all that we mean by Latin civilization.

"Nevertheless . . . even the average Latin student can acquire in a couple of years far more than he realizes. . . . In learning the fundamentals of Latin he inevitably picks up some grasp of the anatomy of language and the logic of grammar. . . . As for the supremely important type of student training—orderly and logical thinking—every pursuit of learning, of course, provides some of that. But in the junior and senior high-school curriculum, mathematics remains Latin's only rival. For training the mind in the values and uses of syntax, the arrangement of thoughts in sentences, Latin is the most valuable study in the entire curriculum, quite as useful to the budding scientist as to the businessman in the making.

"Unhappily, the position of Latin in our public high-school system was undermined about a generation ago by pressure for more and more so-called 'functional' courses. Just now it is threatened by a demand for more scientific education. In my daily work I hear a great deal about the need for

more training in the sciences, especially engineering, in the United States. . . . Now this shortage of physical scientists and engineers is undoubtedly serious. Our country is evidently lagging far behind Soviet Russia in turning out engineers. The talent scouts of big industry and of Government agencies are scouring the country for young physicists and chemists. Some offers to prospective employees sound truly fantastic . . . salaries up to \$15,000 a year to start, plus other inducements which must sound pretty enticing to the young man or woman still in college, and to the high-school student planning to enter. This kind of gilded vocational environment now being created can hardly fail to influence students, teachers, and parents, likewise school principals, superintendents, boards of education, and curriculum planners. . . .

"We have no choice save to meet the challenge of this scientific age, into which we have all been propelled with what often seems like the speed of a guided missile. But we cannot all be—and certainly shouldn't be—scientists and engineers. What is more, our scientists and engineers are likely to fail in their life-work if they know their own specialty and nothing else. Some of our major institutions of scientific training, like MIT, have realized that danger and taken measures to cope with it. The education of the scientist and the technician requires a leavening of humanistic culture in any civilization worth the name. The point is that the gaps in our scientific education at the high-school level must be filled, where they exist, but not at the expense of a subject so important for so many reasons, as Latin.

"Where should the study of Latin begin? The logical place is the junior high. The three grades, 7, 8, and 9, are regarded by educators as the tryout years . . . giving the pupil experiences from which to decide whether he will take a college-prep or a vocational course in senior high school. . . . This junior high-school period may give him his sole experience throughout his school life in a subject outside the field of his specialty. The least scientific-minded, therefore, should be required to take one science course, to afford him a glimpse into the meaning of scientific method and some knowledge of the forces that surround us. In the same way, I think, all high-school students should have at least an introduction to Latin, if only to grasp a little of the meaningful complexities of an inflected language.

"For the college-bound students I think

Latin should be a required course. It must be required rather than elective because such a course cannot be left to the youngsters or even to their parents. Both, all too often, fail to understand the value of the courses offered.

"There is concrete evidence of a reviving appreciation of Latin in this country. According to the latest figures I have seen from the United States Government Office of Education, there are still about 425,000 high-school students in this country studying Latin. Of our 24,000 public secondary schools, 16,000 offer Latin. Actually, more students study Latin today than any other foreign language except Spanish—a fact which will surprise many people and perhaps even some educators. There are, indeed, encouraging signs of a comeback for Latin from the decline that began in the 1920's. I'm proud of the fact that Ohio has recorded the biggest percentage increase anywhere in the country—from 11.9 in 1949 to 15 percent in 1954. . . . The great problem now, I gather, is to find enough competent teachers to care for the comparative flood of students expected within the next four or five years."

Closing on an autobiographical note, Mr. Sagmaster said, "Speaking as a newspaperman (supposedly a hard-boiled profession), if I had my student days to live over again I would take Latin for at least four years in high school and continue with courses in Latin literature, as well as Greek, in college. This would require cutting out a number of credit hours for other courses—whose names I won't mention, but all of them lie within the vague purview of the 'social sciences.' Several of the Sociology courses I took when I was so eager to keep abreast of the contemporary world were not precisely a waste of time. But much of what was learned in them has long been out of date, and the rest could be acquired by free-lance reading. The Classics, however, never go out of date, and an appreciation of them is not often or easily acquired in a busy man's free time. They call for study under guidance and for the application of habits of study. But what they have to offer—especially to this crowded, hurried and so often frightened age—is a lifelong enrichment of the human mind."

The following three items are digests of papers presented at the Ninth Foreign Language Conference, Lexington, Kentucky, 1956.

WHAT DOES LATIN NEED IN THE HIGH SCHOOL?

WARREN C. SEYFERT

Although Latin is no more unpopular today than 100 years ago, the Latinist is unprepared either intellectually or emotionally to face the competition necessitated by the withdrawal of rigid supports, i.e., college and high-school requirements. Is the study of Latin still necessary for the high-school student? Greek has proved dispensable—with little evidence of intellectual decline. What substantial, demonstrable, and efficient arguments can Latin teachers propose for retaining their subject in the curriculum?

A sensible set of goals is needed. I think it time you reversed your trend and attached your wagon once more to some lofty purposes. In trying to maintain your place in the firmament, you've settled for some comparatively trivial functions. If you want to be handmaidens, so be it. If all Latin has to offer is a bit of help in learning English, and mastering the Romance languages, plus a little skill in soap-carving and map-making, let's be done with the whole thing. Surely you have something better than this. Why cannot your students and I know what these greater values are, and why don't you bring them to us persuasively, effectively?

If Latin poetry and prose have majesty and beauty to stir the mind and move the soul, let them be used to do so. There is too little of such moving and stirring in the world today. I expect something to happen to my boys in a Latin class which will make them different and better people; and being able to explain the Latin basis of "remiss" is not what I am talking about.

What Latin may need is more great teachers, teachers wise in language and also wise in boys and girls, teachers who have the wisdom and vitality to capture their students. Adolescents are caught and held by fine and significant things and not by pleasant diversions. They are rather shrewd shoppers in distinguishing between chromium-plated trinkets and the solid gold articles you have in your vaults.

Much is being done in developing new and revised programs for gifted students in the natural sciences and in English language and literature. I have heard of no corresponding activity in classical languages. Competition for the small number of talented students is rough, but I am convinced it would be profitable for you to take a little of the time spent in de-

signing enticements for average students and use it to see what you could provide a few gifted young people. You should undertake this difficult assignment. One thing it cannot be is merely a chronological telescoping of the traditional Latin curriculum. The gifts of our talented boys and girls consist—in addition to unusual speed of learning—of wide range of interest, depth of perception, penetration of questions, vigor of imagination. (General observation leads me to believe that you have none or almost none of these outstanding pupils from your school in your own upper-year classes. What you are likely to have are the slightly better-than-average plodders.)

Among other possibilities, if the Latin teacher will turn English teacher, there must be some contributions he can make to the understandings and skills the twelve-year-olds have in English. If he would teach the Latin of English, I think he would have a place in the English program. Certainly in the upper-school years his knowledge of classical writings and forms would enrich greatly many otherwise rather humdrum efforts in comparative literature.

What Latin may need most is some new content—and methods appropriate thereto. When you think about it long enough, you just have to admit that verb forms, the Helvetians, and Roman senators make a pretty thin diet. I want something to excite the mind. Surely there must be in the body of classical and mediæval Latin, materials loaded with ideas which, if properly presented, would make a schoolboy's mind snap and sparkle.

Milwaukee (Wisconsin)

Country Day School

CAN THERE BE A NEW CURRICULUM IN HIGH SCHOOL LATIN?

KENNETH SMIDA

Much criticism, the needs of today's youth, and the demands of our complex society are causing scrutiny and revision of our entire secondary-school curriculum. Yet we Latin teachers still carry on the same courses which our grandfathers met in their classrooms. Rather than take bold measures, the Latin teacher is too likely to be looking back, and keeping memories alive.

Surveying our status, we do find various obstacles: administrators seeking added room and teacher manpower, perhaps even looking for the end of Latin; guidance counselors advocating the abolition of language-study; some disillusioned parents denying

any value in Latin-study for today's world. Conversely, the downfall of Latin has been predicted by educators and "unbelievers" for years, and we're still going strong.

One of our greatest assets is in the teachers of Latin. No other field can boast of equal calibre and quality. We must utilize all our powers then to meet the tremendous challenge we face—to investigate present conditions and prescribe a remedy even if only for our own immediate surroundings.

We hear that our work is geared to college requests—how many of our high-school students continue with college Latin? Of those who do, we hear they do not understand, or know nothing of poetry—how much verse can we teach under present conditions? When our students should be ready to enjoy and utilize their two years' preparation, they bid us farewell and turn to other interests. What about Vergil, Ovid, Cicero, and others for these same students in the two-year program? I do not believe one must master Caesar before attempting Cicero, Vergil, or others.

In my proposed program, I attempt to give all students, even within the second year, a chance to read more than Caesar. In this way I believe we can encourage more pupils to try advanced Latin both in high school and college. I base much of my optimism on the fact that we all have different tastes, individual likes and dislikes. Why not recognize these differences in our prescribed reading?

I suggest then that all Latin students begin on an equal level in the eighth or ninth grades, and proceed for at least three semesters of intensive basic work, say, to the middle of the second year. From this point forward each student would choose (after being briefed and advised by his teacher) his course for the next semester. Choice among four or five semester-courses would be available, depending upon the local situation. This variety, opening a brand new approach to language study for the high-school student, would provide him with a broader insight into the literature, and lead us to expect a much better developed product, as well as a more contented one.

Works of proven worth should be offered without imposing a strict pattern. I would suggest Caesar, Cicero, Vergil, Ovid, a poetry-anthology including Horace, Catullus, and others. I might add, since I've had such a demand for it, a course in composition for advanced students, including conversation, and perhaps even medieval Latin.

This list would vary with the interests and needs of the school.

Opponents of this plan may say one cannot cover all of the usual work of any one writer in one semester. True, but is it necessary to read all four Catilinarians to appreciate and understand Cicero and the Roman republic? Must we read all of the first six books of the *Aeneid* to be stirred by the struggles of Aeneas and the Trojans? It would be far better to have enkindled a fire in the gifted student to read further for himself.

Materials can be obtained from long unused Vergil and Cicero texts on school storage-shelves. The problems of scheduling one-semester courses are not really as great as they appear, although I must admit I have not approached this particular phase with my school authorities to any extent. Shall we say in this case we must "make haste slowly"?

We are fostering a change most beneficial to education and to our secondary-school structure, in line with "the return to the Humanities." For the student it provides an entirely new concept of Latin study and, if administered as suggested, will effect a more complete picture of great literary works of the past and a truer knowledge of Roman civilization and culture. To the teacher all of this affords either a great challenge or absolute breakdown, for it will mean many preparations and many hours of hard work before it operates smoothly. But as we note the sharp decline in enrollments beyond the second year, and search for a means whereby a higher proportion will continue, this can well be a start. Finally, in view of the growing shortage of teachers trained in Latin, we can hope to lead many more to teaching, through a greater appreciation of and a deeper insight into the Latin language and literature.

Westfield Senior High School
Plainfield, New Jersey

SHOULD CAESAR BE DEFEATED?

DOROTHY ROUNDS

"Caesar's vision pierced the centuries, and where he conquered, civilization dwelt." Winston Churchill wrote thus about the man whose *De Bello Gallico* is being attacked by those who think this masterpiece of Latin prose and narrative history is too dull, too mature, too untimely to arouse any interest in Latin in today's pupils, or a desire to continue the study.

Phaedrus, Catullus, and Ovid have been suggested as substitutes. Class questions would obviously then arise from our pupils,

as a result of spottiness or lack of continuity in the selections. The questions asked on Caesar are usually spontaneous too, but seldom of the kind where one wonders not how to answer them, but whether to do so.

If an immediate objective is to teach the pupil to read, Latin style must be considered. Figures of speech, imaginative language, the complex form of poetry disrupt the train of thought of the learning pupil. He can't keep up, even in English poetry. In prose, facts can be paced. The Latin pupil may have had three semesters of preparation, including Ritchie's *Argonauts*, which is superior preparation for Caesar. He is ready to advance on Gaul with a feeling of surety and the anticipation of reading a real Latin author.

Of the seventy-eight pupils in our Latin II classes who commented anonymously on Caesar (after next year's programs had been made out) only seventeen said they did not enjoy him. Of these, six gave no reason, five observed that it was hard to translate, and six that it was not interesting. Sixty-one pro-Caesar reasons included "interesting," "it makes you think," "it's about action," "exciting," "it's history."

Caesar offers a medium then whereby pupils can be taught to read, a "clear, concise," even "luminous" medium. Caesar's style encourages logical thought procedures. The advantage of concentrating on this author for most of a semester is obvious. He had his place in the shaping of the Latin language, and for this reason the study of his works gives a branching-out point to the pupil.

The real attack was launched when colleges dropped the Latin requirement. The attack was not against Caesar but against Latin, and landed on Caesar. Caesar should not be defeated. Rather he should be encouraged and cheered as the man who can save Phaedrus and Catullus, and can even rescue Cicero and Vergil.

Arlington (Massachusetts) High School

The following is a *digest* of a report on a survey (of lower-level college Latin courses) endorsed by CAMWS, Chicago, 1955; the full report was presented at the CAMWS meeting in Lexington, 1956.

THE CAMWS COLLEGE LATIN SURVEY

J. D. SADLER

Of forms sent to 609 colleges, over 50 per cent or 311 replies were received. About one third of these were valueless either because of no Latin taught, or because the

Latin courses taught were at too high a level for the survey questions. The enrollment breakdown shows no uniformity of offerings, although the majority of colleges offer some work normally given at the high-school level. Some, however, offer no high-school Latin. For the others, every possible combination appears between these two extremes. The estimated five-year trend in enrollment shows a rise. Beginning Latin shows a slightly higher percentage of gain than the total trend, proving simply that beginning Latin is assuming greater importance in college programs. The six-hour beginning course is still standard, with eight- and ten-hour courses becoming more popular. Refresher (reading-knowledge) courses are often listed for the second year to include beginners. Compromise solutions are a system of unequal assignments for a mixed group, and two extra hours of lab a week for the unprepared.

Foreign-language entrance requirements range from zero, the large majority, to four years or more—even four years of Latin. For the A.B., two years of college study, depending on high-school study, are general. Requirements range from zero to three years of college or more. There seems to be a high correlation between the amount of Latin taken in college and the foreign-language requirement. One fourth of the colleges place students by some examination. One third allow the beginning language to be repeated for credit. Substitution of Latin and Greek for the mathematics requirements is allowed by a few colleges, but this is offset by those permitting the substitution of modern languages and not the classical ones.

Support for Latin is offered by the modern languages, English, theology, philosophy, and history for the most part. Others mentioned are Humanities, general-education programs, pre-law, pre-medicine, comparative literature, early Humanities, archaeology, stratigraphy-paleontology, medical-records-library, journalism, sociology, music, and the A.B. honors group. Seventeen colleges require Latin for the A.B. degree.

Two textbooks designed for college Latin account for half of the beginning courses, with the modern reading-method book outnumbering the other two to one. The rest use a mixture of college and high-school texts, readers, and mimeographed materials. The content ranges from a true college text and a reader or two down to a beginning high-school text and nothing more. In the second year the majority fol-

low a high-school sequence with Cicero and Vergil, but everything including Erasmus and the *Ars Amatoria* may also be found. Over one half of the teachers develop vocabulary and grammar from reading. About 80 per cent require memorization of noun and verb paradigms. Audio-visual aids are scarce except among those using the Michigan Workshop materials.

The amount of class time spent in writing Latin varies from 0 to 66 2/3 per cent. The average is 19 per cent. Sixteen people do none, and several others report very little. Nearly one half of the teachers dictate in oral Latin. About 30 per cent employ some Latin conversation. Nearly all require students to read Latin aloud, and this item represents the greatest unanimity on any question in the survey.

Reactions to the question on materials are: "the greatest need is for a book which groups material, treats students as intelligent adults, and has good connected reading"; "a condensed grammar for college students"; "a selection of intellectually respectable reading material from the whole field of Latin literature"; "a Latin grammar of the quality of Crosby and Schaeffer or Chase and Phillips in Greek."

Recommendations:

1. We need more information of this kind. The more we know about our current situation, the better equipped we are to fight our battles. We need to cooperate fully with the APA in its current study.

2. We need some sort of standardization in college courses. A transfer student could well find his year of Latin is worth less than one semester in terms of his new school. A minimum answer might be a series of standardized tests for comparison.

3. This survey revealed several schools where a departing Latin teacher has not been replaced. Such a vacancy can result in a loss of Latin to that college forever. The openings are now in the capable hands of Professor Carr and the League Placement Bureau, but in addition we need a state-by-state spy system with one of the classical organizations to act as clearing house.

4. Last of all, the "ideal beginning college text has not yet been written."

My gratitude is extended to all of you who have made this report possible.

Furman University

Author's note: *Modern Language News* 8, no. 1 (February, 1956) gives the following enrollments for colleges: Latin 8,000; German 29,455; Spanish 41,329; French 50,202.

CICERO'S ESSAYS IN COLLEGE (SECOND YEAR)

BERNICE L. FOX

The increasing acceptance of Latin, especially among high-school students, is encouraging. However, there is an alarming casualty rate between high school and college, mostly because the college freshman (usually with two years of high-school Latin) is afraid that he is not prepared for college Latin. Vocabulary deficiency is one of the reasons for this fear, and it is also the basic reason that he finds college Latin an ordeal if he registers for it. A student reading in English skips most of the words he does not know and tries to get the idea of the sentence without these words. But this practice is not feasible in reading Latin; therefore, each preparation means a dull session of dictionary work. Some students spend more time looking up words than actually translating. . . .

It seems to be traditional to teach Cicero and Virgil in second-year college Latin courses. Obviously these are two authors most worth the intermediate student's effort. In teaching Cicero, I have found college students more responsive to the two essays, *De Senectute* and *De Amicitia*, than to the orations. But the vocabulary in these essays is admittedly difficult for any but the exceptional student at this level. For that reason I have made an analysis of the vocabulary in these two essays, and I give the students a selected word list to become familiar with before attempting to read the essays. This list contains 137 words which occur in the two essays twenty times or more, plus twenty-two words from *De Senectute* and twenty-nine from *De Amicitia* which occur as many as ten times in the one essay but not as many as twenty times in the two combined. I put into the student's hands this list, arranged in the order of the number of times the words appear. . . . The first assignment for the student is to learn these words. He has the incentive to do so since he can see that he will meet these words frequently. And he is not overwhelmed by facing all at once the more than 1,600 words that are used in either essay.

Most of the approximately 1,500 words that appear in each of these essays fewer than ten times occur only one to three times. Many of these the student will have to check in his dictionary, but many of them he already knows since they include

such elementary words as *ager*, *bellum*, and *puer*.

Around this basic list of 137 words, much vocabulary work can be grouped. For instance, the personal pronouns and their possessive adjectives appear 895 times; the irregular adjectives and adverbs in their three degrees appear 347 times; the phrase "not only . . . but also" appears 62 times in various forms; verbs with the suffix *-esco* appear 33 times; and nouns whose ending is *-tio*, *-tia*, *-tas*, or *-tudo* appear 817 times. . . .

If a student learns this basic vocabulary, his work in translating is immeasurably simplified. Any part of it he learns makes the reading just that much easier. And as his sense of frustration decreases, his sense of accomplishment and pleasure increases.

I shall be very glad to send this list and other pertinent notes on the vocabulary of these two essays, upon request, to any other teacher who feels that they will be of value to him.

Monmouth College

MARY ISABEL SIBLEY FELLOWSHIP

Phi Beta Kappa announces the Sibley Fellowship, to be awarded in 1957 for the study of "Greek language, literature, his-

tory, or archaeology." (This award is offered alternately for work in French and in Greek.) "Candidates must be unmarried women between 25 and 35 years of age who have demonstrated their ability to carry on original research. While the doctor's degree is not a requirement, only those doctoral candidates will be considered who have completed 'course' or 'residence' requirements and expect to devote full-time work to research. . . . The award has a stipend of \$1,500 and will be made biennially until the income permits more frequent awards. . . . It is the hope of the Committee that the results of the year of research will be made available in some form, though no pressure for publication will be put upon the recipient of the Fellowship."

The Fellowship Committee: John W. Dodds, *Chairman*, Professor of English, Stanford University; Walter R. Agard, Professor of Classics, University of Wisconsin; William C. DeVane, Professor of English, Yale University.

"All communications, including requests for application forms, should be addressed to the Mary Isabel Sibley Fellowship Committee, The United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa, 1811 Q Street, N.W., Washington 9, D.C." Applications for the 1957 award must be filed before March 1, 1957.

The FL Program and the Classical Languages

The Steering Committee for the Foreign Language Program of the Modern Language Association of America believes that the obvious relevance of modern language study to modern life should not blind educators or the American public to the importance of our having more citizens who know ancient languages. It is not only that our Western civilization is more intelligible to those who can directly read its origins and development in our heritage from Greece and Rome; there is also the urgently modern fact that our children and grandchildren are going to have to understand this Western heritage. . . .

Accumulating evidence shows that a first foreign language can most readily be learned in childhood and learned primarily as spoken language. Unless Latin is taught in this way, we believe that study of an ancient language is best postponed until secondary school age, and that an ancient language can be learned most efficiently if a modern foreign language has first been approached as speech. Hence we recom-

mend that the study of Latin as a second foreign language be vigorously promoted in our secondary schools, and we further recommend that administrators, counsellors, and teachers of modern languages . . . take practical steps to encourage more students to learn ancient Greek, Hebrew, classical Arabic, Chinese, and Sanskrit.

Latin is the parent language of French, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese. It has also, with Greek, furnished nearly the whole of our English intellectual vocabulary. Its literature is the key to many basic concepts. . . . Ignorance of this cultural heritage is a dubious preparation for cultural advance. Ignorance of one's linguistic heritage is, moreover, a dubious basis for informed and effective use of either English or a modern Romance language. We view the decline of Latin in American education as an unfortunate result of radical and short-sighted effects to "modernize" the curriculum and make education "practical." . . . (Reprinted, by permission, from *PMLA* 71 [1956] no. 4, part 2, p. xxiii.)

How Did Augustus Stop the Roman Revolution?

CHESTER G. STARR

THE CAREER OF Augustus must fascinate the historian in many respects. While on the one hand his reign marks the beginning of a new era of Roman history, it represents on the other hand a halt to a century of unrest. So impressive was his success in securing his own personal mastery and in pacifying the Roman Empire that we may easily forget the difficulty of his task in stilling the troubled waters. Yet much, if not most, of his activity must have been dictated by his deep appreciation of the problem of putting up permanent dams and dikes against a spirit of chaos.

To set the stage, we must scan briefly the turbulent last century of the Roman Republic. The wars of this era were essentially a struggle of individuals and factions for mastery of the state, rather than a crusade for a great principle; but the unrest affected all elements of the Mediterranean world. There was no certainty of life for aristocrats or even for common folk, caught at Rome in gang warfare, on the seas by piracy, on land by the breakdown of order due to wandering slaves, brigands, and external invasions or by the great drafts required to man the warring armies.

Nor was there certainty of property. Men of moderate means, like Virgil, as well as aristocrats lost their lands in the expropriations required to reward the veterans; the coinage was unstable and limited in quantities; taxes were imposed arbitrarily and on some occasions for ten years at once. Warfare itself erupted only occasionally, but the generations of the Late Republic lived across an unsettled century; the last two decades before the victory of Augustus in 30 b.c. were particularly troubled. Men's minds were attuned to the spirit of change, of *res novae*, and any adventurer—Catiline or Spartacus, for example—could fan up trouble

swiftly. In such an age the militaristic spirit seemed endemic.

By 30 b.c. the youthful Augustus had secured temporary domination over this troubled world, and in August of that year he saw in Egypt the corpses of his foes, Antony and Cleopatra. At the moment Augustus was the master of 60 legions, of 900 warships, and of a world accustomed to violent action. How, now, was he to consolidate his own position, unlike his great-uncle Caesar, and secure the aim which he later announced in an edict?

May it be my privilege to establish the State in a firm and secure position, and enjoy therefrom the rewards of which I am ambitious, that of being called the author of the best possible government, and of carrying with me when I die the hope that the foundations which I have laid for the State will remain unshaken.¹

A complete answer to the problem just set would involve an analysis of the long career of Augustus in all its manifold aspects. One reason for his success was the superb, mostly unconscious manner in which all parts of the Augustan system dovetailed. Neither Augustus nor his contemporaries would have understood the subtle modern analyses of the Augustan reorganization of the constitution, and might well have been amazed at the overtones we find in such terms as *pater patriae*, *auctoritas*, etc.—but it certainly is true that the program of restoration and consolidation carried out under the direction of Augustus was one of the most wide-scale and deft efforts ever attempted.²

Much of the Augustan program is familiar to any student of ancient history, but certain facets of his rule must be singled out here. These aspects are the Thermidorian reaction, the conservative temper of the Augustan Age, his own use of force, and his concessions to the basic factors which had

produced the upheavals of the Late Republic. To understand how these aspects helped Augustus to restore order, it may be helpful at points to compare his career with that of his closest modern parallel, Henry VII Tudor, who ended the protracted agony of the Wars of the Roses and firmly established Tudor rule in England.

At the outset, it is clear that the reign of Augustus witnessed what modern times would call a Thermidorian reaction. Men were weary of change and anarchy, and craved peace and order. In the Augustan Age we can easily find many parts of the general pattern which appeared in France during the period of the Directory, or in England under Henry VII, or, for that matter, in most societies after a great war or extended internal upheaval. The mass of the population had been jolted long enough out of its usual ways and had exhausted its political energy; as J. D. Mackie notes of England in 1485:

If there could rise a claimant to the throne whose title was good enough to satisfy the conservative instincts of England, and if that claimant had power enough to gain the crown, then he could keep it — as long as he had the power to do so. If he gave the good order which would allow a practical people to realize their practical ends he would meet with little opposition on the part of outraged principle.³

Since Augustus gave good order by his efficient government, the inhabitants of the Roman world were little inclined to oppose him. Rather, the provincials revered this giver of peace; the nobles and common citizens of Rome were ready to grant more power to Augustus than he himself desired. Particularly notable was the tendency of the upper classes to turn away from politics to the enjoyment of life, a common aspect of Thermidorian reactions at all times.⁴ To explain the troubles of the past, the contemporaries of Augustus, like men in more recent days, sought a scapegoat. France of the Directory made Robespierre its villain; Charles II of England hung the corpse

of Cromwell; the contemporaries of Henry VII called Richard III a usurper. In its turn the Roman nobility damned the memory of dead Caesar—and the adopted son of Caesar permitted them to do so without demur.⁵

In such a temper, society does not desire an idealistic leader who will push it into new fields and fresh crusades. The Augustan Age tended strongly to turn back to the past, in literary models, in religion, and in many other fields.⁶ This tendency Augustus followed, rather than initiating; as Syme observes, he "was a singularly archaic type."⁷ Augustus had begun to enunciate a policy of restoration of old ways at least by 40 B.C., and by 36—after his victory over Sextus Pompey—his break with what may be termed Caesarian radicalism was quite obvious; for the rest of his life he pursued a conservative policy.⁸ Augustus was no wild-eyed visionary, but a calm arbiter, almost a living statue. Syme notes in Augustus "the hard realism, the lack of chivalry, the caution and the parsimony;" one student of Henry VII Tudor has described his reign in almost exactly the same terms:

There is no romance in it, no clashing of arms, no valiant deeds, no suggestion of the heroic. The King's enemies are, for the most part, contemptible persons; the King himself is a cold-blooded, long-headed ruler, merciful indeed, but from policy, not from generosity, and of a meanness in money matters very far from royal.⁹

Yet neither a Thermidorian reaction nor a general tendency to seek the order of the past would in themselves be enough to bring order in a chaotic present. In the year 1485, says Mackie, "England was sick of the war; yet there seemed to be no reason why the war should stop."¹⁰ Henry VII had just gained the throne by battle, but he might well prove another ephemeral leader, a bubble in the continuing froth. So too Augustus—but both Augustus and Henry VII were able (barely) to hold their power long enough for the

spirit of reaction to aid them in re-establishing order.

Augustus was in root a military dictator. This result of the Roman civil wars was inevitable, for after violent revolutions or extended unrest the patterns of society are so disrupted that force must be used to bind that society together.¹¹ Here particularly, modern theoretical analyses of the Augustan Principate tend to blind us to the basic problem and to the basic solution. Augustus, like Henry VII, had to consider the constitutional prejudices of his subjects. Henry, observes Bacon, "was a great observer of formality in all his proceedings, which notwithstanding was no impediment to the working of his will."¹² No better description could be coined of the manner in which Augustus operated; and a further observation by Bacon is, I think, as true of Augustus as of Henry VII:

As for the disposition of his subjects in general toward him, it stood thus with him; that of the three affections which naturally tie the hearts of the subjects to their sovereign,—love, fear, and reverence,—he had the last in height; the second in good measure; and so little of the first, as he was beholding to the other two.¹³

At the very beginning of his career the youthful Augustus had shared in a terrific blood-letting of the Roman aristocracy, the proscription of 43, for which he is too often exculpated by modern scholars. Thereafter he was clement by policy, but he had and used force as necessary. Exile of dissidents played a considerable part in smoothing his way throughout his life; the laws *de vi* and *de maiestate* were mighty tools to strike down opposition within a legal framework; by oaths a great part of the subjects was bound to support the Augustan regime. There are sufficient indications that a network of spies, as well as volunteer informers, kept watch over the city of Rome and its aristocracy. We today know that Augustus was to live out a long life as ruler, but in and after 30 B.C. neither

Augustus nor his subjects could be sure of that fact. For a decade after what proved to be his final victory Augustus faced plots, much as did Henry VII in the first years after 1485; but both had their personal bodyguards and by watchful vigilance prevented serious trouble.¹⁴

We must not minimize the importance of this basic reliance upon might when we consider how Augustus halted the chaos of the Late Republic. In such a period, strong action, or the realization that strong action may be used, "will convince many wavering minds that the best course is compliance;"¹⁵ or, as Richard Hildreth once observed: "The might to govern must of necessity carry with it the right to govern; and in this sense,—and a very important sense it is, too—Might does actually make Right."¹⁶

By the visible or potential employment of force, then, Augustus checked for a decisive moment the demons of unrest. In that moment of time the spirit we call Thermidorian and the conservative, backward-looking temper of the Augustan Age could begin to work their calming influence. The factors which have just been sketched, however, do not entirely explain how Augustus halted the Roman chaos.

At least as important was the fact that Augustus deftly compromised with the deep forces which had produced that chaos and so exorcised their power. We must, at this point, look at the Late Republic again and determine precisely what it was that Augustus did stop.

Nowadays there is a common tendency to call the last years of the Republic the Roman Revolution. Since the term "revolution" may mean many things, I have no great quarrel with its usage here—provided that the expression "Roman Revolution" does not lead the unwary to visualize the era as a great social whirlwind, rising suddenly and fraught with ideological drives.¹⁷ The so-called Roman Revolution, after

all, covered a century, and its problems were very directly political in nature. Naturally these problems arose from the economic, social, and intellectual upheaval which accompanied the unification of the Mediterranean, and in turn they gave rise to further social and economic unrest; but the key to the great changes, to simplify the highly complicated, was primarily the necessity of adjusting an ineffective political machinery to the governance of a Mediterranean-wide empire. Closely linked with this problem, but logically on a secondary plane, was the admission to the governing class itself of new elements of importance.

In the half-century which preceded Augustus—at least since the days of Sulla—the practical needs of empire had forced the Romans to take great steps toward solving the basic political problem by enlarging their political and military structure; Augustus now consolidated this enlargement and through careful employment of good deputies greatly improved the efficiency of the government both in Rome and in the provinces. Augustus also provided a common ideal for the Empire which could bind it together. This ideal was primarily his own figure as an earthly messiah or savior; but we must not forget that he also distributed citizenship to leading provincials and to soldiers on a scale which, though less than that of Caesar, was still remarkable in terms of late Republican practice. By these steps Augustus essentially countered the basic cause of the unrest of the Late Republic.

These aspects of the Augustan system have often been pointed out, but students of Augustus have sometimes failed to note the skilful manner in which he coupled both safety valves and checks for the continuing spirit of excitement, of desire for action, which lingered in the men of his day. Though parsimonious, like Henry VII, Augustus realized as well as the first Tudor the need for displays and games to appease

the multitude; as one actor boldly told Augustus, "It is to your advantage, Caesar, that the people should devote their spare time to us."¹⁸ Augustan Rome, again, was in a constant bustle of building and enlargement. Culturally as well, Augustus encouraged declamation, poetry, and other literary diversions for the energies of the noble class.

Yet, while fostering harmless activity in these fields, Augustus carefully put on the reins of disciplined order. Actors and athletes, though favored, were supervised lest they excite the masses too much. In the field of arts and letters, Augustus encouraged the contemporary popularity of classical forms, which interrupted the febrile experimentation of the age of Caesar and Cicero.

Augustus likewise handled carefully the militaristic spirit which he inherited from the recent past. His conquests, I think, were not solely designed to gain defensible frontiers, as they are usually described; they were almost as much an outlet for the craving for excitement and glory of his troops and particularly of his noble generals. To the best of his ability Augustus calculated whether a war would be profitable—he remarked that fighting a war was like fishing with a gold fishhook—but nonetheless fight he must to a certain degree.¹⁹ In this light, the trouble he encountered when he did refuse to right becomes explicable. His negotiated settlement with Parthia obviously did not please all elements of the Roman world, and so had to be carefully justified by edicts and coins; his refusal to follow in Caesar's steps and conquer Britain had to be explained to the public.²⁰

It is at this point perhaps that Augustus' skill is most impressive. As Burckhardt observed of the Renaissance dictatorships, "the necessity of movement and aggrandizement is common to all illegitimate powers;"²¹ and the career of Napoleon, who rode the

spir
perl
to s
spe
who
peac
such
Th
fine
whic
fact
of th
he c
forc
first
histo
peac
own
fully
mili
he c
cont
the I
tially
Au
with
the I
citize
Augu
tant
fully
prev
to th
of th
one
laps
revol
arist
As
comp
revol
unde
neces
they
large
publi
tance
amon
that
hinde
Amer
the F

spirit of war to his downfall, is a superb example of what too often happens to such dictators. Augustus in this respect resembles far more Henry VII, who had to fight France but did so as peacefully as possible,²² than he does such a warlord as Napoleon.

The military sphere, in sum, is a fine example of the deft manner in which Augustus countered the basic factor which had produced the unrest of the Late Republic. On the one hand he consolidated the military and naval forces thrown up by that era into the first great standing army and navy of history, superb tools to give lasting peace to the Empire and to assure his own power. Yet on the other he carefully channeled and damped down the military spirit. By the end of his life he could advise his successors to be content with the current boundaries of the Empire—and later emperors essentially heeded that advice.²³

Augustus was as successful in coping with the secondary aspect of unrest in the Late Republic. Italy had been given citizenship after the Marsic war, but Augustus now consolidated an important movement of the Late Republic by fully opening the aristocratic circle, previously a jealously exclusive clique, to the equestrians and leading elements of the Italian cities. Here particularly one can profit by comparing the collapse of the old regime in modern revolutions with the collapse of the aristocracy in the Late Republic.

As Crane Brinton pointed out in a comparative study of several modern revolutions, states which are about to undergo these fiery ordeals are not necessarily in economic difficulties; they may, indeed, be thriving by and large—as was Italy in the Late Republic.²⁴ “Of much greater importance,” he observes, “is the existence among a group, or groups, of a feeling that prevailing conditions limit or hinder their economic activity.” So the American merchants in the 1770’s; so the French middle class shortly there-

after—and so too the Roman equestrian order and Italian middle classes felt themselves in the Late Republic to be economically important but politically impotent. Even more interesting is the fact that modern ruling classes about to fall are usually splintered and feel “that they hold power unjustly, or that all men are brothers, equal in the eyes of eternal justice, or that the beliefs they were brought up on are silly, or that ‘after us the deluge.’”²⁵ A similar corruption of the Roman nobility, both in principles and in courage, followed the era of the Gracchi and of Sulla; Syme in particular has noted how men like Hortensius and the Luculli withdrew to their villas, there to raise their prize fish and brood on “the folly of ambition.”²⁶

Broken in spirit, ravaged by the wars and proscriptions, financially crippled, the old Republican aristocracy had to accept under Augustus an *amalgam* of all types of elements into a new governing class.²⁷ Thenceforth the society of the Roman Empire was a “hierarchical society of social climbers,”²⁸ an escalator onto which able men might step, and rise. Such a situation is not democracy — Thermidorian periods are usually reactionary against truly popular government — but in one way or another the Augustan structure gave to all important elements of the Roman world a place which satisfied them.

By the end of the reign of Augustus some men might sense that peace and order had been bought at the price of dull efficiency. Tacitus a century later could detect this fact clearly, especially in the opening scenes of his *Annals*; but even the new generation of Augustus’ last years, a generation which had not lived through the stress of civil wars, exhibited signs of restlessness which caused Augustus considerable anxiety in his last decades. Nonetheless his task had been well performed, and the spirit of unrest had been adequately tied down by visible and in-

visible bonds. Within the framework of all human history Augustus must stand as one of the most successful restorers of order after chaos; as a result of his work the Roman world was to enjoy essential peace for two centuries to come.

University of Illinois

NOTES

- ¹ Suet. *Aug.* 28.
- ² As an introduction to the vast subject cf. *Augustus: Studi in occasione del bimillenario Augusteo* (Rome, 1938); M. A. Levi, *Il Tempo di Augusto* (Florence, 1951); and my bibliography in *Civilization and the Caesars* (Ithaca, 1954) pp. 388-390.
- ³ J. D. Mackie, *The Earlier Tudors, 1485-1558* (Oxford, 1952) p. 22; cf. also A. D. Innes, *England under the Tudors*, 8th ed. (New York, 1926) p. 57.
- ⁴ *Civilization and the Caesars*, pp. 63-72; Ronald Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939) pp. 513-518; Crane Brinton, *The Anatomy of Revolution* (New York, 1938) pp. 261-270.
- ⁵ Brinton, *Anatomy*, pp. 251-252; William M. Alexander, "Cato of Utica in the Works of Seneca Philosophus," *Trans. of the Royal Soc. of Canada*, ser. 3, 40 (1946) 59-74; cf. his remarks in *Trans.* 35 (1941) 23-28.
- ⁶ Cf. especially Eduard Norden, "Vergils Aeneis im Lichte ihrer Zeit," *Neue Jahrb.* 7 (1901) 249-282, 313-334.
- ⁷ *Roman Revolution*, p. 454.
- ⁸ Cf. *Civilization and the Caesars*, pp. 36-39; "Virgil's Acceptance of Octavian," *AJP* 76 (1955) 34-46.
- ⁹ Innes, *England under the Tudors*, p. 57; Spedding's observations in Francis Bacon, *History of the Reign of King Henry VII* (The Works of Francis Bacon, ed. James Spedding et al., vol. 11 [Boston, 1860]) p. 25; Syme, *Roman Revolution*, p. 454.
- ¹⁰ *Earlier Tudors*, p. 22.
- ¹¹ So Brinton, *Anatomy*, p. 247.
- ¹² *History*, pp. 38-39 (an earlier sketch by Bacon).
- ¹³ *History*, p. 362; cf. Mackie, *Earlier Tudors*, pp. 5 ("his ultima ratio is force") and 190 ("an autocrat by consent").
- ¹⁴ Cf. *Civilization and the Caesars*, pp. 72-79; the spirit of the Empire is, I think, superbly summed up by Tertullian, *Anology* 2. 8: "Against those guilty of treason, against public enemies, every man is a soldier." On Henry VII. cf. Bacon, *History*, pp. 64-65, 216-217, 231, and especially 131-132 and 335 on Henry's laws against riots and treason; also Mackie, *Earlier Tudors*, pp. 63 (oaths), 75 (edicts against rumors), 122-123 (spies), 66-67 (uneasy position). The weak health of Augustus, of course, tended to heighten the uncertainty of his first decade as sole ruler.
- ¹⁵ John P. Roche and Milton M. Gordon, "Can Morality Be Legislated?," *N. Y. Times Mag.*, May 22, 1955, p. 44.
- ¹⁶ *Theory of Politics* (New York, 1953) p. 20.
- ¹⁷ And this is a very real danger; even Syme, *Roman Revolution*, p. 38 and Levi, *Augusto*, pp. 145-146, seem led by their use of the term to find a proletarian spirit in some aspects of the Late Republic. The masses of Italy were discontented in the period, but all they seem to have hoped for was the emergence of a savior who would break with aristocratic inefficiency; as the chaos swirled on, even the aristocrats themselves turned to accept the inevitability of a lasting dictator. The cry of *libertas* was much raised in the Late Republic; but its meaning was ambiguous, and "popular" banners so inscribed were tawdry covers for the personal egoism of ambitious nobles and factions. Cf. Hans Kloeisel, *Libertas* (Diss. Breslau, 1935) esp. pp. 33-47 (with full references); Ch. Wirszubski, *Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome during the Late Republic and Early Principate* (Cambridge, 1950) pp. 31-52. Note the scant attention to the ideal by Caesar (Kloeisel, pp. 48-52). Cf. also my "Perfect Democracy of the Roman Empire," *AHR* 58 (1953) 1-16, with references.
- ¹⁸ Dio Cass. 54. 17. 5; cf. Mackie, *Earlier Tudors*, pp. 192-193; and Bacon, *History*, p. 358.
- ¹⁹ Suet. *Aug.* 25. 4.
- ²⁰ The Parthian evidence is well collected by Neilson C. Debevoise, *A Political History of Parthia* (Chicago, 1938) pp. 139-141, 144, 207-210. On Britain cf. Dio Cass. 53. 22. 5; 53. 25. 2; Tac. *Aggr.* 13; Strabo 4. 5. 3.
- ²¹ Jacob Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, trans. S. G. C. Middlemore (Modern Library, 1954) p. 71.
- ²² Cf. Mackie, *Earlier Tudors*, pp. 81-82, 109-111; Bacon, *History*, p. 181, notes the disgust with Henry as one who "did but traffic with that war."
- ²³ Dio Cass. 56. 33. 5-6. Cf. the observations by Bacon, *History*, pp. 355-356, on Henry VII: "He professed always to love and seek peace. . . . Yet he knew the way to peace was not to seem to be desirous to avoid wars. . . . In the quenching of the commotions of his subjects he ever went in person; sometimes reserving himself to back and second his lieutenants, but ever in action."
- ²⁴ One of the greatest merits of Rostovtzeff's work is his strong emphasis on the rise of Italy; cf. the first chapter of his *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1926) and chapters VI-VII of his *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (Oxford, 1941). On the exclusion of the new men cf. Syme, *passim*; and the penetrating survey by Lily Ross Taylor, *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar* (Berkeley, 1949); an illuminating modern parallel to this clique politics is that of the American South in the 1890's (W. J. Cash, *The Mind of the South* [Anchor Books, 1954] p. 253). On the new men themselves cf. Joseph Vogt, *Homo novus: Ein Typus der römischen Republik* (Stuttgart, 1926); Werner Schur, "Homo novus," *Bonner Jahrb.* 134 (1929) 54-66; and the rather mechanical survey by H. Hill, *The Roman Middle Class in the Republican Period* (Oxford, 1952).
- ²⁵ Brinton, *Anatomy*, pp. 40, 44, 65; cf. the similar remarks by Mackie, *Earlier Tudors*, pp. 15-18, on the crumbling morality of the English nobility by 1485.
- ²⁶ Syme, *Roman Revolution*, pp. 72-23. Also significant is the economic weakening of the aristocratic class due to their luxury and their loss of land from the time of the Gracchi on; cf. Tenney Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, vol. I (Baltimore, 1933) pp. 239, 252, 387-392.
- ²⁷ A well-known fact which can be seen in the poetry of Virgil and Horace (the latter not altogether syncretistic) as well as in the prosopographical detail heaped up by Syme.
- ²⁸ I owe this apt phrase to C. V. Wedgwood, *The King's Peace, 1637-41* (New York, 1955) p. 433.

The Structure of Horace's Odes: Some Typical Patterns

JANICE M. CORDRAY

AT THE BEGINNING of a lecture Henry Nettleship once stated, "To attempt to say anything new about Horace may seem absurd. But it is a characteristic of philological and historical study that the same subject admits of being viewed from different points and this is particularly true in the case of a great poet."¹ I believe the *Odes*, especially, because of their universal appeal, lend themselves to discussion from many aspects and by every generation.

Modern scholarship embraces many different opinions concerning the structure of Horace's *Odes*. Structure in this instance refers to the way in which the main subject is developed in an ode and the manner by which the poet directs the thought from part to part. This subject has been mentioned often, perhaps considered with special reference to a few odes, but more often dismissed with a word about its difficulty. In the eighteenth century Bentley recognized the problem and attempted to solve it by wholesale correction of the text; later, Peerlkamp used much the same unsatisfactory method. Today, however, few of the emendations or transpositions of these two men are accepted. Sellar, still recognized as an outstanding authority of the Roman poets of the Augustan Age, touches on the question without investigating it thoroughly. Tyrrell considers that the problem is not to be solved: "In his odes Horace thought chiefly about the felicity of expression, and deftness in handling new and dainty meters, and, provided the verses flowed smoothly and the phraseology showed his *curiosa felicitas*, did not trouble

himself whether the train of ideas was consecutive, or indeed whether there was any regular march of thought at all." On the other hand, those editors of the nineteenth century most successful in interpreting the *Odes*, Orelli, Dillenburger, Ritter, and Wickham, accepted them as they have been preserved for us and did not consider many passages spurious.² It is the work of the latter scholars which is most acceptable to the present generation. Horatian scholars of this century, too, propose varying theories and opinions.³

My purpose, therefore, has been to study the structure of all the *Odes* by considering the following questions with reference to each one:

1. What is the main subject of the ode? Or is there more than one?
2. How is this subject developed and into what parts can it be divided?
3. What means of transition are there between the parts?
4. How are the parts related to the whole? Is the ode a structural unit?⁴

I have found that there are certain typical thought patterns in the *Odes*, and that that characteristic of Horace's poetry often described as *curiosa felicitas* (Petronius, *Sat.* 118. 5) is vital to the structure.

The simplest pattern is found in many of the short odes in which the main subject is developed in two parts. In at least nine odes, the first part states the situation or a general observation; the second part expresses a contrasting aspect of the same thought.⁵ For ease of discussion I shall call the first part A, the second B. As an example, let us consider 1. 38, which may be divided between verses 4 and 5. The ode is addressed to a slave, and the first verse expresses one aspect of the main

Mrs. Cordray presented this paper on the program of the Southern Section of CAMWS meeting in Jackson, Mississippi, November, 1956.

thought: "I hate Persian elegance." Horace adds that garlands woven on the linden bast displease him and that it is not necessary to search for a late rose in order to satisfy him. In contrast to *Persicos . . . apparatus* (1) (the word *Persicos* alone meant luxury and extravagance to the Roman), the second part begins with *simplici myrto* (5), the simple myrtle which is pleasing. "I strive diligently lest you add anything to this simple myrtle which is fitting for both you as servant and me as master." Horace has expressed the same thought in contrasting ways: first in the negative through the pomp and extravagance which he hates, *odi* (1); secondly in the affirmative through the simplicity he prefers, *curo* (6). This ode also illustrates particularly well the effect of *curiosa felicitas* on structure. By careful choice of words and their positions, Horace has bound the two contrasting parts into a structural whole. Note the balanced position of *displacent* (2), *neque . . . dedecet* (6-7); *mitte sectari* (3), *nihil allabores / sedulus curo* (5-6); *sera moretur* (4), *simplici myrto* (5).

Let us look at other examples more briefly. In 2. 15, just as in 1. 38, there is contrast between the negative and affirmative aspects of the same thought. A tells of the luxury to be found in the near future, B of the absence of this luxury in the virtuous past; in A Horace introduces clauses by *iam* (1), *undique* (2), *tum* (5, 9), all followed by the future tense, in B *non ita* (10), *nulla . . . porticus* (14-16), *nec* (17), followed by the past tense. The implication of both parts is, of course, that the simple life is best. In 3. 12, Neobule's soliloquy, there is contrast between the general and specific. A expresses a general thought. "Wretched the maids," *miserarum* (1), "who may not give play to love nor drown their cares in sweet wine, or who lose heart, fearing the lash of an uncle's tongue." B is a specific application. "From thee, *Neobule* (5),

Cytherea's winged child snatches away thy wool basket," etc., *tibi* (4). Following this example of a specific maiden, lines 6-12 are devoted to a description of the youth Hebrus, a specific application of *amori* (1). On the other hand, in 3. 18, in which Horace asks for the blessing of Faunus, A expresses the more specific, Horace's relation to Faunus, *Faune, Nympharum fugientum amator, / per meos finis . . . incedas* (1-3); B expresses the more general relationship of the village to the god: *tibi . . . festus in pratis vacat otioso / cum bove pagus*. In these two odes also we may note similarity in form and expression in A and B: in 3. 12, the use of infinitives, A—*miserarum est neque . . . dare . . . neque . . . lavere aut exanimari* (1-2) and B—*catus . . . iaculari et . . . excipere* (10-12); in 3. 18, *amator* (1) and *fossor* (15) and additional contrast between the idea in *amator* (1) and *invisam . . . terram* (15-16). Ode 3. 20 illustrates contrast between two moods in the two rivals, Pyrrhus and Nearchus, tension vs. indifference. Binding links are the use of proper names, A—*Pyrrhe, Gaetulae* (2), B—*Nireus, Ida* (15-16) and the similar expressions, A—*quanto* (1), B—*qualis* (15), A—*raptor* (4), B—*raptus* (16).

The next pattern is one in which the subject is developed in four parts. I have called the first two AB as before. Since the third is closely related to the first and the fourth to the second, the whole pattern may be termed ABA'B'. The first example is one in which contrast is again important. It is 2. 9 (divided 1-8, 9-12; 13-17 *semper*, 17 *desine*-24) addressed to Valgius in the first part. The first eight verses introduce the ode by listing natural phenomena, all similar in that they may be described by *non semper* and in that they are unpleasant. "Not always do showers fall on the fields, storms harass the Caspian or does ice cover the Armenian shore," etc. The third strophe, B, discusses Val-

gius, who, in contrast, is described by *semper*, his characteristic being unpleasant also. "He is always mourning the dead Mystes." The second main section of the poem is introduced by *at non* (13) . . . *semper* (17). These connecting words show contrast with B but similarity to A and introduce two examples from tales of heroes. "Nestor did not always weep for Antilochus or the Phrygian sisters for Troilus." The examples serve as arguments for the advice Horace is about to give in B'. "Cease finally thy weak laments," referring back to B; "rather, let us sing of the new trophies of Augustus Caesar." Thus Horace gives examples from nature in A and the stories of the heroes in A' as reasons why Valgius should not weep as in B and should sing of happy things in B'. This interlocking of the ideas creates a unified poem. In addition, note the use of place names in the first section, *Caspium* (2), *Armenius* (4), *Gargani* (7), and the last, *Niphaten* (20), *Medum* (21), *Gelonos* (23); the sequence of clauses connected by *non* . . . *aut, nec, aut* in the first section and a list of substantives connected by *et, et, que, que* in the last; the similarity in choice of words and ideas, *flebilibus modis* (9), *ploravit* (14); *amores* (11), *amabilem* (13); *tu semper urges* (9), *nec* . . . *flevete semper* (15-17). Thus the parts are more completely bound together.

Twelve odes are constructed in this general pattern.⁶ The subjects are varied and include love, *carpe diem*, an invitation, *recusatio*, etc. There is more variety in the relation of one part to another than in the simpler pattern, but A' and B' always develop the same aspect of the main thought which is in A and B. The example just discussed illustrates contrast between the negative and affirmative. In 1. 19, A expresses the general, B the specific; A' and B' repeat this pattern. The ode may be divided: 1-4, 5-8; 9-12, 13-16. In the first part, "Venus and Cupid and Licentia order me to re-

turn to loves I thought were finished." *Amoribus* (4) leads the thought forward to the following specific example. "It is the beauty of Glycera which inflames me. Bringing love, she forbids me to sing of Parthians and Scythians and things which do not matter." Horace, therefore, decides to remedy the situation by specific means in B', "Lads, set up an altar here, bring flowers and incense to me. She, the goddess, will come more gently when there has been a sacrifice," *lenior* (16) in contrast to *tota ruens* (9) and *saeva* (1). Further examples may be mentioned. In 1. 36, divided 1-3, 4-9; 10-16, 17-20, A introduces the celebration of Numida's safe return and B the close relationship between the two friends, Numida and Lamia. A' elaborates on the celebration and B' stresses the very close relationship of Bassus and Damalis, who are attending the festivities. In 1. 17 (divided 1-12, 13-14 *est*; 14 *hic*-20, 21-28) an invitation to Tyndaris to come to the Sabine farm, the persons involved, Faunus and Tyndaris, are stressed in A and A', while B and B' stress the idea of protection as granted to the farm by the gods and to be given to Tyndaris if she comes to the farm.

These are but two of the patterns which Horace follows. The conclusions to be drawn from them, however, are the same as from the others. In each ode there is one main subject, but the same general subject is developed in different ways in different odes. Just as every one would not make the same paragraph divisions in a prose passage, so there may be variations in the divisions of these odes; yet it is clear that there are certain basic structural patterns. It is possible in each ode to discover how Horace has joined together the various parts by development of ideas, by similarity or contrast in words and forms. Contrasting ideas are just as strong a connection, and frequently, a more effective one, than completely harmonious thought. In

modern poetry often many words can be altered without making much difference to the meaning of the whole, but in an ode of Horace every word has a structural function and is important to the sense of the whole. Certainly, this ability of the poet to bind his thoughts together so intricately and subtly is one of the qualities which has placed him as he wished "among the number of the lyric bards" and enables us to find something new in the *Odes* each time we reread them.

Sweet Briar College

NOTES

¹ "Horace: Life and Poems," *Lectures and Essays* (Oxford, 1885) p. 143.

² Q. Horatius Flaccus, *ex recensione et cum notis atque emendationibus Richard Bentley*, 3rd. ed. (Berlin, 1869) vol. 1; Q. Horatius Flaccus, *Carmina*, ed. P. Hofman-Peerkamp (Leiden, 1834); W. Y. Sellar, *The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age: Horace and the Elegiac Poets* (Oxford, 1892); R. W. Tyrrell, *Latin Poetry* (Cambridge 1895) p. 206; Q. Horatius Flaccus, *recensuit atque interpretatus est I. G. Orellius*, 4th ed. (Berlin, 1886-92); *Opera Omnia*, ed. G. Dillenburger (Bonn, 1881); *Opera Omnia*, ed. F. Ritter (Leipzig, 1856); *Opera Omnia*, ed. E. C. Wickham (Oxford, 1877) vol. 1.

³ A. Y. Campbell, *Horace: A New Interpretation* (London, 1924) pp. 5-6, considers that there is no

example of a sudden transition due to carelessness in writing or laxity of thought in the *Odes*; Horace's transitions are deliberate, and once the reader has caught the trick they are always effective and powerful. To Campbell the distinguishing feature of the *Odes* is their form. "They are constructed more carefully, more skillfully, and more often perfectly, than perhaps any other poems that were ever written." T. R. Glover, *Horace: A Return to Allegiance* (Cambridge, 1932) p. 53, on the other hand, believes that "he either does not scheme his poems very clearly, or he abandons his scheme, or perhaps his art is to be artless." More recently, Wilkinson's treatment in *Horace and His Lyric Poetry* (Cambridge, 1945) has been criticized by Copley (*AJP* 67 [1946] 281) because "in his discussion of the form of the ode, he has not got to the bottom of the problem at all, else he could never have made the observation (on *Odes* I, 9) that 'the poem, then, is not intentionally formless' p. 131. It is not formless at all. Nor is its unity, as Wilkinson claims, a subtle thing, derived 'from the undercurrent of nature symbolism.'"

⁴ The complete study may be found in an unpublished dissertation, "The Structure of Horace's *Odes*" (Johns Hopkins University, 1952). Four additional studies, each treating a specific aspect of the topic, are as follows: K. Buchholz, *De Horatio Hymnographo* (Regimonti, 1912); G. Reincke, *De Tripartita Carminum Horatianorum Structura* (Gräfenhainichen, 1929); H. L. Tracy, "Thought-Sequence in the Ode," *Phoenix* 5 (1951) 108-118; Felix Heinemann, "Die Einheit der horazischen Ode," *Mus. Helv.* 9 (1952) 193-203.

⁵ Book 1, 23, 26, 38; book 2, 15; book 3, 12, 17, 18, 20, 28. In addition, 1, 20, an invitation, and 1, 30, a hymn, may be included in this pattern.

⁶ Book 1, 17, 19, 36, 37; book 2, 5, 9, 11, 12; book 3, 14, 24; book 4, 2, 9.

Martial 6. 35

Friend Cecil lifted loud his voice
and made the judge concede
seven turns of a full water-clock,
his time in which to plead.

But he is talking much too long,
and he is talking still;
warm water from the speaker's glass
he breaks his neck to swill.

Oh may our Cecil satisfy
the urge of thirst and talk!
and to this end we counsel him —
Drink from the water-clock.

MARTHA C. HEATH

New Haven, Connecticut

Lupus in Fabula

KENNETH M. ABBOTT

*Lupus in fabula*¹ is an expression familiar enough to any Latinist—in fact, at least in some areas of the world, to any Latinist who can reach the level of proficiency described by Stephen Leacock, that is, who is able to look at a page of Latin and a page of Greek and tell which is which. Almost any dictionary of quotations in any modern European language will cite our proverb; I am told, on reliable authority, that two generations ago German schoolboys used *lupus in fabula* as a standard expression, and Muret-Sanders lexicon professes to find a German proverb made from it in a catch-as-catch-can translation "Der Wolf in der Fabel."²

The reason for this great popularity of the proverb might, of course, be just cause for wonder, whether it might be Terence's long-standing popularity as a school-author, or the fondness of the Latin grammarians for citing this particular expression.³ Certainly it can hardly be said to occur frequently in Latin literature: once in Terence's *Adelphi*,⁴ once in Cicero's *Letters*, and with the variant *lupus in sermone* in the *Stichus* of Plautus. At any rate, well-known it is, and it has never, so far as I have noticed, caused anyone any trouble, consciously, in modern times. As the grammarian Pompeius (*Comm.* 5, p. 311, 31 K) succinctly puts the case: *puta de nescio quo loquebaris et subito venit is, dicis tu, "lupus in fabula."*

We have, then, as everyone knows, a close English equivalent in "Speak of the devil," or "Talk of the devil," depending on one's age or dialect. The contexts in which our proverb occurs amply justify the parallelism as exact. In Terence, *Ad.* 537, in the midst of a conversation between Ctesipho and the slave Syrus, Syrus breaks in with an expression of shocked surprise: *Em*

tibi autem! Ctesipho, whose back is apparently turned, anxiously inquires, *Quidnamst?* and is answered, *Lupus in fabula.* CT. *Pater est?* SYR. *Ipsest.* And Cicero (*ad Att.* 13. 33. 4) writes: *De Varrone loquebamur: lupus in fabula; venit enim ad me.* The case in Plautus differs really not at all in sense and tone. In *Stichus* 577 the parasite Gelasimus, about whom the others have been talking, heaves in sight. Epignomus, catching sight of him remarks, *Atque eccum tibi lupum in sermone:*⁵ *praesens essuriens adest,* at which Pamphillippus suggests, *ludificemur hominem,* and Epignomus agrees.

Up to this point all is well. But if one looks further, one will find that dictionaries or commentaries or encyclopedias⁶—not, of course, the *Thesaurus*—will proceed to explain the proverb, and explain it in a rather curious way, something like this: *Lupus in fabula*, i.e. "the wolf in the story," i.e. "speak of the devil." One can even find the passage in *Stichus* 577 rendered in a well-known American version "the wolf in the story."⁷ That ought to clear matters up for the Latinless reader! Or is he more likely to ask, "Such as what story?" Since, I venture to say, this explanation has never explained anything yet, what I wish to address myself to is whether it is even relevant, let alone adequate.

I should like to insert at this point an explanation that I come to this matter somewhat *pietatis causa*. What seems to me the simple and totally unmysterious meaning of *lupus in fabula* I came by in the simplest and most obvious fashion. I was told the answer by my friend and teacher, the late Professor W. A. Oldfather of the University of Illinois, who intended, if time ever allowed for such a small subject in the press of his large projects, to publish a note. But since his

modern poetry often many words can be altered without making much difference to the meaning of the whole, but in an ode of Horace every word has a structural function and is important to the sense of the whole. Certainly, this ability of the poet to bind his thoughts together so intricately and subtly is one of the qualities which has placed him as he wished "among the number of the lyric bards" and enables us to find something new in the *Odes* each time we reread them.

Sweet Briar College

NOTES

¹ "Horace: Life and Poems," *Lectures and Essays* (Oxford, 1885) p. 143.

² Q. Horatius Flaccus, *ex recensione et cum notis atque emendationibus Richard Bentleii*, 3rd. ed. (Berlin, 1869) vol. 1; Q. Horatius Flaccus, *Carmina*, ed. P. Hofman-Peerkamp (Leiden, 1834); W. Y. Sellar, *The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age: Horace and the Elegiac Poets* (Oxford, 1892); R. W. Tyrrell, *Latin Poetry* (Cambridge 1895) p. 206; Q. Horatius Flaccus, *recensuit atque interpretatus est I. G. Orellius*, 4th ed. (Berlin, 1886-92); *Opera Omnia*, ed. G. Dillenburger (Bonn, 1881); *Opera Omnia*, ed. F. Ritter (Leipzig, 1856); *Opera Omnia*, ed. E. C. Wickham (Oxford, 1877) vol. 1.

³ A. Y. Campbell, *Horace: A New Interpretation* (London, 1924) pp. 5-6, considers that there is no

example of a sudden transition due to carelessness in writing or laxity of thought in the *Odes*; Horace's transitions are deliberate, and once the reader has caught the trick they are always effective and powerful. To Campbell the distinguishing feature of the *Odes* is their form. "They are constructed more carefully, more skillfully, and more often perfectly, than perhaps any other poems that were ever written." T. R. Glover, *Horace: A Return to Allegiance* (Cambridge, 1932) p. 53, on the other hand, believes that "he either does not scheme his poems very clearly, or he abandons his scheme, or perhaps his art is to be artless." More recently, Wilkinson's treatment in *Horace and His Lyric Poetry* (Cambridge, 1945) has been criticized by Copley (*AJP* 67 [1946] 281) because "in his discussion of the form of the ode, he has not got to the bottom of the problem at all, else he could never have made the observation (on *Odes* I, 9) that 'the poem, then, is not intentionally formless' p. 131. It is not formless at all. Nor is its unity, as Wilkinson claims, a subtle thing, derived 'from the undercurrent of nature symbolism.'"

⁴ The complete study may be found in an unpublished dissertation, "The Structure of Horace's *Odes*" (Johns Hopkins University, 1952). Four additional studies, each treating a specific aspect of the topic, are as follows: K. Buchholz, *De Horatio Hymnographo* (Regimonti, 1912); G. Reincke, *De Tripartita Carminum Horatianorum Structura* (Gräfenhainichen, 1929); H. L. Tracy, "Thought-Sequence in the Ode," *Phoenix* 5 (1951) 108-118; Felix Heinemann, "Die Einheit der horazischen Ode," *Mus. Helv.* 9 (1952) 193-203.

⁵ Book 1, 23, 26, 38; book 2, 15; book 3, 12, 17, 18, 20, 28. In addition, 1, 20, an invitation, and 1, 30, a hymn, may be included in this pattern.

⁶ Book 1, 17, 19, 36, 37; book 2, 5, 9, 11, 12; book 3, 14, 24; book 4, 2, 9.

Martial 6. 35

Friend Cecil lifted loud his voice
and made the judge concede
seven turns of a full water-clock,
his time in which to plead.

But he is talking much too long,
and he is talking still;
warm water from the speaker's glass
he breaks his neck to swill.

Oh may our Cecil satisfy
the urge of thirst and talk!
and to this end we counsel him —
Drink from the water-clock.

MARTHA C. HEATH

New Haven, Connecticut

Lupus in Fabula

KENNETH M. ABBOTT

*Lupus in fabula*¹ is an expression familiar enough to any Latinist—in fact, at least in some areas of the world, to any Latinist who can reach the level of proficiency described by Stephen Leacock, that is, who is able to look at a page of Latin and a page of Greek and tell which is which. Almost any dictionary of quotations in any modern European language will cite our proverb; I am told, on reliable authority, that two generations ago German schoolboys used *lupus in fabula* as a standard expression, and Muret-Sanders lexicon professes to find a German proverb made from it in a catch-as-catch-can translation “Der Wolf in der Fabel.”²

The reason for this great popularity of the proverb might, of course, be just cause for wonder, whether it might be Terence's long-standing popularity as a school-author, or the fondness of the Latin grammarians for citing this particular expression.³ Certainly it can hardly be said to occur frequently in Latin literature: once in Terence's *Adelphi*,⁴ once in Cicero's *Letters*, and with the variant *lupus in sermone* in the *Stichus* of Plautus. At any rate, well-known it is, and it has never, so far as I have noticed, caused anyone any trouble, consciously, in modern times. As the grammarian Pompeius (*Comm.* 5, p. 311, 31 K) succinctly puts the case: *puta de nescio quo loquebaris et subito venit is, dicis tu, “lupus in fabula.”*

We have, then, as everyone knows, a close English equivalent in “Speak of the devil,” or “Talk of the devil,” depending on one's age or dialect. The contexts in which our proverb occurs amply justify the parallelism as exact. In Terence, *Ad.* 537, in the midst of a conversation between Ctesipho and the slave Syrus, Syrus breaks in with an expression of shocked surprise: *Em*

tibi autem! Ctesipho, whose back is apparently turned, anxiously inquires, *Quidnamst?* and is answered, *Lupus in fabula.* CT. *Pater est?* SYR. *Ipsest.* And Cicero (*ad Att.* 13. 33. 4) writes: *De Varrone loquebamur: lupus in fabula; venit enim ad me.* The case in Plautus differs really not at all in sense and tone. In *Stichus* 577 the parasite Gelasimus, about whom the others have been talking, heaves in sight. Epignomus, catching sight of him remarks, *Atque eccum tibi lupum in sermone:*⁵ *praesens essuriens adest,* at which Pamphilippus suggests, *ludificemur hominem,* and Epignomus agrees.

Up to this point all is well. But if one looks further, one will find that dictionaries or commentaries or encyclopedias⁶—not, of course, the *Thesaurus*—will proceed to explain the proverb, and explain it in a rather curious way, something like this: *Lupus in fabula*, i.e. “the wolf in the story,” i.e. “speak of the devil.” One can even find the passage in *Stichus* 577 rendered in a well-known American version “the wolf in the story.”⁷ That ought to clear matters up for the Latinless reader! Or is he more likely to ask, “Such as what story?” Since, I venture to say, this explanation has never explained anything yet, what I wish to address myself to is whether it is even relevant, let alone adequate.

I should like to insert at this point an explanation that I come to this matter somewhat *pietatis causa*. What seems to me the simple and totally unmysterious meaning of *lupus in fabula* I came by in the simplest and most obvious fashion. I was told the answer by my friend and teacher, the late Professor W. A. Oldfather of the University of Illinois, who intended, if time ever allowed for such a small subject in the press of his large projects, to publish a note. But since his

miscellaneous files contain nothing but the title and a few references. I am constrained to argue the case in my own way, without, I hope, making him responsible for either the trend and tone of the argument or the somewhat devious by-paths into which consideration of the question may lead me.

If *lupus in fabula* is well-known from any literary text—and it makes no difference at the moment whether that is correct or not—the text is clearly Terence, *Ad.* 537, and those who set out to explain it quite naturally apply to Dziatzko-Kauer's commentary (Leipzig, reprinted 1921) where a learned note is, as is to be expected, available. I take this to be a case, so frequent in recent years, of those who may be led astray by a good book. I shall, therefore, use the note as a point of departure. After summarizing the material from Otto's well-known book on Roman proverbs (*Sprichwörter der Römer* [Berlin, 1890]), the note concludes (I translate):⁸

Beyond a doubt there is a reference to a story about a wolf which appeared exactly when someone mentioned him. A fable of this content has not been preserved to us: the beginning of Aesop 275 Halm (as well as 275b and 275c) might possibly fit. Our passage, as well as that of Plautus (*Stichus* 577) doubtless comes from the Greek original and has reference to the fable.

Now to leave aside for the moment the problems which this comment raises (one of them is that it really ignores the Plautus passage which it cites) we see at once that Aesop 275, which is Babrius 1. 16 and Avianus 1. will not in its entirety do at all. If I may recall it to you, it is a sophisticated little anecdote about the wolf who happened by at the time a nurse was attempting to frighten a fractious child with the threat to throw him to the wolf. The wolf, with pleasurable anticipation, waited patiently but of course in vain, finally being compelled to return home without provisions and a rather improbable story to tell his

wife, pointing out the moral that this is what people get who believe women. All this has nothing to do with the case, and Kauer doesn't really say that it does.

On the other hand it is certainly true that wider search does not provide us with anything which will really do. Stith Thompson's invaluable *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature*⁹ provides enough material to satisfy even the most confirmed wolf-story addict—if any—yet nothing which will quite do to explain our proverb as part of a story. Here we may see that Kauer was wiser than he knew in saying that this would suggest the *beginning* of a story. Someone spoke of the wolf and the wolf came. Herodotus himself couldn't make anything interesting of materials like that, and the one thing we could confidently predict of a story constructed of these items is that it has no future. If so, why are we predicting an influential past for it? In short, how did we come to suppose that there ever was a story about a wolf which would explain our expression? There is nothing at all allusive about it; it bears no resemblance to folk or comic expressions which within living memory owe their origin to scenes or stories, such as "Damn clever these Chinese," or "No soap," or even, what I am a little surprised to see a soft-drink company using, "Vive la difference." There is nothing in our expression to suggest that it has its roots in a context no longer present.

If, with so much warning, we look to see what information we can get as to how the Romans understood the proverb, or whether they did, we find Donatus in his note on *Ad.* 537 giving his own explanation, one variant which he merely mentions, and one which he sharply rejects. He begins, *Silentii indicio est in hoc proverbio*—which is not, of course, really true; there is no declaration or imposition of silence involved in it—then goes on to refer it to the superstition which he cites from

Vergil, *Ecl.* 9 and Theocritus that a man who has seen a wolf, or particularly if the wolf has seen him first, is struck dumb. The substance of this is repeated by Servius on *Ecl.* 9. 53 and by Isidore in two places (*Ety.* 1. 37. 28 and 12. 2. 24). There is no help here. Donatus then goes on: *Alii putant ex nutricum fabulis natum pueros ludificantium terrore lupi*, i.e., that it arose from the stories of nurses scaring children about the wolf. We have already learned about this, i.e., "The wolf will get you if you don't behave." Again a blind alley. Donatus continues: *Nam falsum est, quod dicitur, intervenisse lupum Naevianae fabulae alimonia Remi et Romuli, dum in theatro ageretur*. "For it is not true, as reported, that a wolf appeared in a play of Naevius for the feeding of Romulus and Remus when the piece was being acted in the theatre." This is at least interesting, but it might be a good deal clearer. It can be, and has been, variously interpreted. It has been understood, I think quite impossibly, to mean that the wolf was brought on as a character in the play about Romulus and Remus.¹⁰ I should take it that Donatus' source meant that during the performance of the play—*dum in theatro ageretur*—a wolf appeared unexpectedly in the theatre to give suck to Romulus and Remus. But however we interpret, or if, what is perhaps wiser and what I take Leo to be doing,¹¹ we decline to interpret, in any case the story is what Donatus says, a palpable fiction. It does, however, put us in a familiar context. We may readily deduce that there was nothing in the scholarly tradition available to Donatus, or so far as he could tell to his predecessors, which answered the question, "Why *lupus in fabula*?" That being the case, what sort of response would we expect to find?

I think we may safely assert that normal human behavior, if an expression turns out to be somehow troublesome, would resemble either that of the oyster with the grain of sand or

the fairy-tale of the princess and the pea; either, that is, to coat the rough edges with something smooth, which may be in human terms to tell an aetiological myth about it (our story about the wolf in Naevius' play) or, in the other case, merely to thrash about restlessly rather than getting up and removing the offending object. What I wish to point out in particular is that this is a process not confined to Roman grammarians, nor to antiquity and the Middle Ages. What is widely advertised as the scientific temper of the modern age has by no means dissipated it. The Roman scholar may well have been in the position of the oyster, which cannot simply evict the irritating grain of sand, but must somehow come to terms with it. Which is to say, he was likely to have no place to look it up. What happens with us?

This is the sort of thing which the average American speaker would call "just an expression," which is to say that he'd rather not think about it and probably wouldn't get anywhere if he did. Anyone is familiar enough with "Speak of the devil," to be sure, mostly without any consciousness of the particular attitude or superstition which brought it about, nor does it greatly matter. We can all concede that "the moon is not made of green cheese" in the confident expectation that while the astro-physicists and radio astronomers are making a mess of the tidy things we learned in school, this is one observation they can't refute. It is only people of the odder sort who wonder why, in any case, green should be the color of the cheese the moon is not made of, and fewer those who can bring themselves ease by finding out that the green cheese is only fresh cheese. We all know, further, that anyone who uses the expression "the exception proves the rule" is very likely to do so without any precise notion of what he is saying, since the statement in its normal form appears to fly in the face of all human reason. We are now, however, getting

to a type more troublesome, with a resultant thrashing about, and the speaker if pressed will very likely show the desire to explain what he does not understand (which some of us think particularly characteristic of the twentieth century), and will hazard the explanation that, of course, "proves" means "tests," which is false on the face of it. And this in spite of the fact that the relatively easy task of looking in the *Oxford English Dictionary* will produce the information that the background of the expression is a legal maxim which in its full form runs: "the exception proves the rule in the cases not excepted."

Or again we may still congratulate others, or more frequently ourselves, for calling a spade a spade, without inquiring what else there would be to call it except a spade. Not even the most confirmed and inveterate city-dweller could very well call it a hoe, a spading fork, or even a shovel. It is amusing, although perhaps not instructive, to find what I am sure is the true source of the expression illustrated by A. S. Ferguson.¹² Erasmus, in compiling his work on proverbs and confronted with the Greek proverb *skáphēn skáphēn légein*, correctly deduced that *skáphē* was connected with *skápto* "dig," but incorrectly that it should mean "a digging thing" and translated it *ligo*, rather than "a dug-out thing," a tub or basin. His translation was promptly translated into English and what might well originally have been to "call a basin a basin" is still going in a vigorous, if somewhat nonsensical, form.¹³

If I may now pursue the subject of the explanation by fictitious narrative, I should like to illustrate with the case of the Irish potato. Almost everyone, apparently, thinks he knows the answer to this little puzzle as to why a product of the New World should be called by the name of one of the peoples among whom it was subsequently introduced. The *OED* devotes, conse-

quently, a careful and exhaustive article to the Irish potato, an article which is illuminating as a silent but eloquent rebuke to human folly and ignorant presumption. It quotes explanations authoritative in tone and destroys them one by one. The worst blow comes to those of us who, like myself, learned in school that Sir Walter Raleigh brought the potato back from Virginia to Ireland—the more learned add, on his second trip to Virginia. This bit of general information runs into some slight trouble with the following facts: Sir Walter Raleigh had not been in Virginia on his second voyage; if he had been he could not have found the white potato growing there at the time because it is not native to Virginia; and finally, if he had returned from a territory he did not visit with a vegetable which was not growing there he still would have been several years too late to introduce the potato to the Irish, who had already got it by a rather obscure route apparently starting out from Portugal.

If we may now, I hope with a chastened spirit if not a humble and contrite heart, return to Donatus, we should do so realizing that the grammarians, whatever their defects, and in many cases also the sad state of their texts, had an advantage over us in one important way which we can never overcome: they knew Latin, to borrow a phrase from A. E. Housman, "with the marrow of their bones." From what point does Donatus start his explanation? The superstition referring to the power of the wolf to strike men dumb has nothing to do with the case, to be sure, but what is significant is that Donatus clearly takes his clue from *fabula* in the sense of "talking." And with that clue, we can see that we should have known all along what it meant if we had paid proper attention to Plautus' *lupus in sermone*. He has provided us with the gloss: *fabula* i.q. *sermo*, and our expression means "the wolf in talking,"

i.e. talk about the wolf may bring him. Here the superstition about the power of the word, *nomen omen*, the danger that the wolf, like the devil, may be accidentally invoked, is so well known since the days of Sir James G. Frazer, that we need no more information on this score. And of course every etymologist from Varro to J. B. Hofmann (although with somewhat differing methods) has recognized that *fari* is the source of *fabula*, which should mean "talking," as its verb *fabulor* means "to talk." The true Greek parallel¹⁴ has, then, long been available in Otto: *Ei kai lukou emnésthēs*—"if you speak of the wolf," i.e., he will come. This was the meaning of the proverb, in fact, that Otto was arguing for, although perhaps not clearly or not loudly enough.

In point of fact, *fabula* in the sense of "talk" had never disappeared from Latin at any period, but its real life was in the common speech, not in literature. Clear examples in comedy are, oddly enough, hard to find. But it is likely that the formula *Quae haec est fabula?* (e.g., *Most.* 937, *And.* 747, *Eun.* 789) is, as the *Thesaurus* suggests, "What talk is this?" rather than "What tale is this?"; and the interjection *Fabulae!* is "Idle talk" rather than "Stories" (as at *Ter. Phorm.* 492 or 946). In any event, sporadic instances occur throughout Latin, as at *Lucan.* 4. 200, *bellorum fabula* ("talk of wars"); and the plural *fabulae* (after *sermones*?) is by no means rare, mostly for random, informal talk. *Cicero*, for example, quotes to *Atticus* from a letter of his son (13. 40. 1): *vellem aliquid degustasses de fabulis*, a piece of college-boy Latin perhaps equivalent to "I wish you could get a taste of our chatter." So *Quintilian* (12. 11. 18) writes: *datum fabulis otium*—"free time given over to mere talk"; the usage runs down to the time of *Gregory of Tours*. Another colloquial sense which appears to be both common and late is the slightly shifted

sense of "talk about someone, gossip" as in *Ovid's* autobiographical sketch (*Trist.* 4. 10. 68): *nomine sub nostro fabula nulla fuit*; or *Ps. Quint. Decl.* 344: *Vivit itaque filius tuus et honeste vivit et iam sine fabula* ("without being talked about") *vivit*.

The history of the unpopularity of the verb *fabulor* as a literary term is of course clearer than that of *fabula* and may serve to illustrate what happened. *Fabulor* was studied more than twenty years ago by *Einar Löfstedt* in his brilliant *Syntactica* (1933) and examined intensively by *W. H. Juniper* in an unpublished Ohio State doctoral dissertation, "The Verbs of Saying in Plautus" (1937). *Fabulor* in *Plautus* is a rather common verb; it is used 58 times for intimate or familiar talk or gossip, but apparently less and less as time goes on—only half as often in the later plays as in the earliest. *Terence*, on the other hand, uses the verb only twice in all six plays: once in the speech of a young man who urgently enjoins silence on his slave at a critical moment (*Hec.* 316): *Noli fabularier* ("don't gabble"); and once more in the speech of a slave professing to quote *Phormio* (654): *ut aperte tibi nunc fabuler*, clearly substandard for *aperte loquar*, perhaps something like, "Let me come clean with you." The verb must, as *Löfstedt* demonstrates, have had a lively existence beneath the surface of literary Latin and is still going in *Sp. hablar*, but it appears in literature only in odd and usually contemptuous circumstances, such as *Livy* 45. 39. 15: *de imperatore Paulo quae senatus decrevit potius quam quae Servius Galba fabulatur, audi*—"listen to what the senate decreed rather than the guff of *Servius Galba*."

One might, if there were time, carry the inquiry one step further and ask whether Latin *fabula*, for "play," which is certainly on the face of it no translation of Greek *drama*, as most of the grammarians profess, did not in its early days rather mean "talk, a talk-

ing piece" rather than "a tale." It is a fair question whether *fabula Atellana*, for instance, was not rather Atellan talk than Atellan story. Certainly it is something of a puzzle that the *fabula togata* was certainly not a drama played in the toga but rather in the tunic. Could it once have meant *fabula togata* in the sense of *gentis togatae*—"the talk of the togaed people"? But the information here is scattered, uncertain, and requires delicate handling. For the moment this is quite enough talk about talking.

The Ohio State University

NOTES

¹ Read at the meetings of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, Lexington, Kentucky, April 7, 1956.

² This latter point I mention with a good deal of dubiety. My colleague, Prof. Hans Sperber, who is an expert in such matters, expresses grave doubts as to the real existence of the proverb in German form.

³ There is a good selection in *Thes. L. L.*, s.v. *fabula*, col. 24, 69-70. Those which seem of importance are mentioned or discussed below.

⁴ *Adelphoe*, codd., edd. Yet I think we should hesitate to father this unlovely form on Terence from the *Didascalica*, which has not only this, but at least one other pseudo-antique form: *Graeca Menandru* and, I suspect, *L. Aemelio*. MS. A may quite possibly represent the truth about this kind of Latin with the phrase *acta ludis funeralibus* instead of the (correct) *funeribus* of the minuscule MSS. Terence's inflectional forms, certainly, are Latin, not a mixture of Greek and Latin; not *Menandru* but *Menandri* in *Eun.* 9, 20; *Diphili* in *Ad.* 6, line 11 of this play has in *Adelphos*, which certainly implies nominative *Adelphi*. As to the *Didascalicae*, the information they contain may in some ways go back to Varro, and whatever we have is invaluable, but it is hard for me, at least, to accept the distinct Olde Coffee Shoppe flavor of their form as anything very authentic for the word forms of Terence's period.

⁵ Lindsay's laconic note in his Oxford text: "*lupum* in s. non omnino placet," and his second thought (*Addenda et Corrigenda*) to correct to: "*Fort. delend. atque; lupum* in s. non satis placet" have reference to the scansion of the line and do not really throw doubt on the soundness of this particular phrase. The problem, so far as there is one here, is that *Stichus* 577 is in a long passage of trochaic septenarii running from line 505 to 650, and thus as a trochaic line would scan:

atque ec/cum tibi/ lupum in ser/mone/ praesens/ essurt/ens a/dest.

Shortening (i.e., iambic shortening) of *in* before a word beginning with *s* is very rare. A case in point is *Capt.* 49 (iambic senarius)

ut in ser/vitu/te

which Lindsay in his *editio maior* of that play

(1900) regarded as one of the bits of evidence against Plautine authorship of the prologue. But even if the argument there offered, which cites *Cic. Or.* 159 on the long vowel in negative compounds before *s* and *f* (long in *insanus*, *infelix* but short in *indoctus*, *inhumanus*) were relevant, we should still be obliged to accept the shortening as much as the still more violent case of shortening before *-ns* in *Ter. Ad.* 60:

venit ad me saepe clamitans "quid agis, Micio?"

This, in fact, is the reading which Lindsay accepts in his Oxford text on the support not only of the Terence MSS. but also those of *Cic. de Inv.* 1, 27 where the line is quoted in the same form; cf. also W. A. Laidlaw, *The Prosody of Terence* (London, 1938) p. 23. The argument, however, is not really to the point. A preposition may indeed be proclitic to its noun, but proclisis is not compounding: in *sanum* is clearly not the same as *insanum*, and there is no reason to suppose that the vowel in the first case is lengthened. This kind of theory, which Lindsay himself came to use sparingly, seems to have taken a death grip on many of his successors, and becomes one which lumps together words, compounds, juxtaposes, phrase words and phrases ("word-groups") as if the phonetic and accentual conditions could be the same throughout. In point of fact this kind of operation is not really a theory at all but simple confusion of mind.

⁶ E.g. Hans Lamer, *Wörterbuch der Antike* (Stuttgart, 1950): "*Lupus* in *fabula*, '(wie) der Wolf in der Fabel,' d.h. wenn man von ihm spricht, ist er schon da." I mention Lamer merely as a random sample, not as a criticism of a very interesting and stimulating little book which deserves to be much better known among teachers of the Classics in this country.

⁷ John R. Workman in *The Complete Roman Drama*, ed. George E. Duckworth (New York, 1942).

⁸ "Ohne Zweifel ist Bezug genommen auf eine Erzählung von einem Wolfe, welcher erschien, gerade als man von ihm sprach. Eine Fabel dieses Inhalts ist uns nicht erhalten; der Eingang der Aesopischen Fabel 275 bei Halm (sowie 275b und 275c) möchte etwa passen. Unsere St. sowie die plautinische stammen ohne Zweifel aus dem griech. Original und nehmen Bezug auf die Fabel."

⁹ The new edition (1955) was not available at the time I made this study. Nor, as will be seen below, is it really crucial for an interpretation. On *lupus* in *fabula* as *tabu*, of course, there is material in vol. 1 (Bloomington, Ind., 1932) pp. 379-380; C 10, C 11 and C 12, 1-12, 5.

¹⁰ So W. Beare, *The Roman Stage* (London, 1950) p. 29.

¹¹ Fr. Leo, *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*, pp. 90-91, note 1: "d.h. die Erklärung des Sprichworts *lupus* in *fabula* daraus dass bei der Aufführung des Stückes des Naevius eine Wölfin zur Ernährung des Remus und Romulus erschienen sein soll, ist falsch."

¹² *CR* 30 (1916) 213-216; the explanation Ferguson supports is fully given, of course, in *OED* under "spade." Ferguson derives the Greek proverb from a "protest against the riddling parody of tragedy or dithyramb so common in middle comedy."

¹³ *OED* cites Udall, *Erasm. Apoph.* 167 (1542) as translating "spade."

¹⁴ Diogen. 4, 64, *Corpus Porroem. Graec.*, vol. 1, p. 241.

NOTES

Parallels in Juvenal and Housman

LONG BEFORE A. E. Housman's edition of Juvenal appeared to anger and delight the editors for whom it was prescribed, the acid bite of the Latin poet was deepening its impressions on the mind of young A.E.H. during the student years at Bromsgrove School and at Oxford. As he grew from student to scholar his interest in Juvenal expanded, and the extent of his critical activity in that field may be measured by a glance at A. S. F. Gow's list of his friend's publications,¹ where there are no fewer than forty-six references, glancing and direct, to passages in the *Satires*.

Housman's mastery in Juvenalian scholarship was fully exercised after 1903 when (at that time Professor of Latin in University College, London) he was called upon to undertake the recension of the text of Juvenal for J. P. Postgate's *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*. This enterprise involved him deeply in problems of manuscript authority and led to the production of his definitive text,² which he provokingly subtitled *editorum in usum* and referred to in his Preface as a work done "in humane concern for the relief of a people sitting in darkness."

What is the influence of the Latin satirist on Housman's poetry? It is difficult to trace though we may believe that the mood and temper of Juvenal are widely diffused throughout Housman's poetic comment on the ways of God and man. The number of parallel passages is not great, and of the few offered here I claim for only one the strong likelihood of conscious allusion.

Housman's "The Oracles," which we now read as number 25 of *Last Poems* (1922) but was published first in *The Venture*,³ begins and ends with allusions that may have been revived during his absorption in his work for the

Postgate *Corpus*. The unresponsive oracles are thus described in the opening stanza:

'Tis mute, the word they went to hear on
high Dodona mountain
When winds were in the oakenshaws
and all the cauldrons tolled,
And mute's the midland navel-stone
beside the singing fountain,
And echoes list to silence now where
gods told lies of old.

Compare Juvenal 6. 555-556:⁴

quoniam Delphis oracula cessant
et genus humanum damnat caligo futuri.

Though Herodotus⁵ (to name but one) is more eloquent than Juvenal on the subject of the final stanza of "The Oracles," the first two lines of it may owe something to the Latin poet:

The King with half the East at heel is
marched from lands of morning;
Their fighters drink the rivers up,
their shafts benight the air.

Compare Juvenal 10. 176-178:

credimus, altos
defecisse amnes epotaque flumina Medo
prandente.

Housman's only published translation from Latin poetry is his "Diffugere Nives," collected in *More Poems* (as number 5) in 1936, having first appeared in *The Quarto*.⁶ It is a free rendering of an ode by Horace (4. 7). The opening lines of Housman's concluding stanza,

Night holds Hippolytus the pure of stain.
Diana steads him nothing, he must stay

need no other antecedent than Horace's

Infernis neque enim tenebris Diana
pudicum
Liberat Hippolytum,

but it is possible that Juvenal's taunting question (10. 324-325) was also in

Housman's mind as he turned his final strophe:

quid profuit immo
Hippolyto graue propositum . . . ?

The story of the Pontic king Mithridates VI is used to point the moral of "Terence, this is stupid stuff;" the penultimate lyric of *A Shropshire Lad*. Although many other writers had told the tale that Housman recounted, he must have had in his mind Juvenal's mocking admonition (14. 252-255):

eme quod Mithridates
composuit; si uis aliam decerpere ficum
atque alias tractare rosas, medicamen
habendum est,
sorbere ante cibum quod debeat et pater
et rex.

How similar in tone are these lines (60-62, 67-70):

There, when kings will sit to feast,
They get their fill before they think
With poisoned meat and poisoned drink.

And easy, smiling, seasoned sound,
Sate the king when healths went round.
They put arsenic in his meat
And stared aghast to watch him eat.

In an article "Ciceroniana," published in *The Journal of Philology* (vol. 32) eight years after the appearance of his edition of Juvenal, Housman quotes on page 268 three lines (196-198) from the Tenth Satire and appends his translation:

plurima sunt iuuenum discrimina, pulchrior ille
hoc atque ille alio, multum hic robustior illo;
una senum facies.

To tell young men apart there are many tokens; one is handsomer than another and a third than a fourth; a fifth is sturdier far than a sixth: the old are all alike.

It is Housman's free rendering of *discrimina* as "tokens" that recalls a rare use⁷ of this English term in *A Shropshire Lad*—that and the fact that in his poem (number 23, "The lads in their hundreds . . .") he is also de-

scribing a concourse of young men. He reflects that all but a few of them will outlive their youthful candor; and he regrets, not that this is so, but that there are no tokens by which he can identify the favored ones destined soon to die:

I wish one could know them, I wish there
were tokens to tell
The fortunate fellows. . . .

Housman's word *tokens* here is, I believe, a fairly clear echo from Juvenal; perhaps an echo of an echo. Did the association begin with the Bromsgrove schoolboy who, reading *Sat.* 10. 196, translated *discrimina* as "tokens"? Did the mature Latinist, composing in November 1895 his poem of Ludlow youth, recall and preserve this gloss? Then did the editor of Juvenal, commenting eighteen years later on a passage from Cicero, cite the lines from Juvenal and, translating them, simply quote himself, poet? Perhaps all three questions deserve the affirmative reply. The use of *tokens* (certainly not an off-hand equivalent for *discrimina*) in Housman's poem in a passage so similar in context to that of the quotation from the Tenth Satire⁸ could hardly have been undesigned. In this word Juvenal's youth and the lads from the English countryside come together.

TOM BURNS HABER

The Ohio State University

NOTES

¹ In A. E. Housman: *A Sketch* (New York, 1936) pp. 69 and 93-94.

² London, 1905. The Postgate recension appeared in the same year; Housman's text occupied Part 5 of the second volume.

³ Edited by Laurence Housman and W. Somerset Maugham (London, 1903).

⁴ The quotations are from Housman's revision of his 1905 edition published by Richards.

⁵ 7. 21, 43, 187, 226.

⁶ Vol. 3 (London, 1897).

⁷ The word occurs only one other time in Housman's *Collected Poems*: in *More Poems* 2. 15.

⁸ It may be worth mentioning as another sign of Housman's interest in this passage that he quotes it and his translation of it in his Preface to the reprint of his Juvenal (Cambridge University Press, 1931) p. liii.

Seneca and the "New Insight"

IN HIS BOOK *The Mature Mind* (New York, 1949) H. A. Overstreet tells us that we are entering an age of psychological progress during which man's knowledge of himself may perhaps begin to find practical application, as has long since been the case with his knowledge of the external world. He hails the "new psychological accuracy" which is "bringing insights that are re-making our life" (p. 14). Chief among these is the maturity concept, of which he says (p. 19): "Thus we are given a new way to estimate ourselves and others. *Not all adults are adult.*" In a warning which Overstreet puts into the mouth of Diderot, were he alive today, we are given the corollary (p. 15): "all childish minds are dangerous, but particularly when those minds are housed in adult bodies; for then they have the power to put their immaturities fully and disastrously into effect."

No one can doubt that the maturity concept is of the utmost importance, in its application both to individual lives

and to the general field of social relations. However, in view of the stress which Overstreet lays upon the novelty of this concept, it is interesting to compare Seneca, *Epistulae Morales* 1. 4. 2:

Tenes utique memoria quantum senseris gaudium cum, praetexta posita, sumpsisti virilem togam et in forum deductus es; maius expecta, cum puerilem animum deposueris et te in viros philosophia transcripseris. Adhuc enim non pueritia sed, quod est gravius, puerilitas remanet. Et hoc quidem peior res est, quod auctoritatem habemus senum, vitia puerorum, nec puerorum tantum, sed infantum. . . .

Application of this new insight, according to Overstreet, "becomes our next obligation and hope" (p. 10). It is not becoming, but has always been our obligation and hope; but there is a certain reassurance in finding that in 1949, approaching from the direction of science, Overstreet arrived at the same wisdom enunciated by Seneca almost 1900 years ago.

ROBERT J. LESLIE

Indiana University

The Structure of Nepos' Lives of Miltiades and Themistocles

CORNELIUS NEPOS¹ is not an author of great genius, but critics have generally failed to give him credit for his modest gifts. Friedrich Leo's views are representative of such criticism,² and his analyses of the lives of Miltiades and Themistocles are pertinent for us.

Leo finds that Nepos' *Liber de Excellentibus Ducibus* has no coherent structure (p. 202); he even speaks of the wildly heterogeneous nature (*Bunt-scheckigkeit*) of the book (p. 212).³ Certainly many of the lives deserve these strictures, but that those of Miltiades and Themistocles do not, will be shown through an examination of Leo's analyses of them. He writes thus: "In the life of Miltiades the narrative begins in the first sentence . . . , and with the *akme* (Chersonese, Marathon, Paros),

to be carried through up to his death with emphasis upon his virtues. . . . The structure of the life of Themistocles is in accord with the course of events, as in Plutarch: 6. 1, *magnus hoc bello* (cf. chs. 2-5) *Themistocles fuit nec minor in pace* (cf. chs. 6-7), then the catastrophe; the first part concludes with an epilogue" (p. 203, tr. P.R.M.).

Leo's analysis of the *Themistocles* is superficially correct as far as it goes. But he errs in failing to see in the *Miltiades* a structure very similar to that of the *Themistocles*, to which failure his casual treatment of the epilogue of the latter (5. 3) contributes.

Freedom and its defense is the theme which pervades the two lives and binds them together. It is surprising that

Nepos' devotion to freedom has not been considered one of his main characteristics; for he again and again speaks of tyrants and liberators, of liberty and oppression; and in one of his conspicuously purple passages he glories in the work of Thrasybulus: *Hoc initium fuit salutis Actaeorum, hoc robur libertatis clarissimae civitatis* (Thras. 2. 1).⁴ But references to this subject are more thickly sown in the two lives before us than in any other.⁵ Thus, although Nepos fails to portray in his subjects the individuality which is the mark of real biography, he does relate their lives to the great and stirring events of their times.

Miltiades' period of glorious defense of justice and freedom culminates in his leadership in the triumph at Marathon; the same period in Themistocles' life, with victory in the Salamis campaign. There are significant parallels in Nepos' treatment of these portions of the careers of the two men. Both men had qualified to answer the call of destiny when it came through the Delphic oracle: Miltiades, by a quiet dignity worthy of his distinguished ancestors (1. 1); Themistocles, by brilliant accomplishments in peace and war which atoned for his youthful indiscretions (1. 3—2. 1). Each man against strong opposition made two bold proposals for the liberation of Greece, having his first proposal rejected (Miltiades urged that Darius be left stranded among the Scythians [3. 5]; Themistocles, that the Greek states fight exclusively on the sea [3. 5]), but seeing his second proposal carried out in Greek victory (Miltiades advised that the Persians be met in the field at Marathon [4. 5]; Themistocles, that all be staked on a naval battle at Salamis [4. 2]). Each chose for the Greeks a battle position with the same thought: *ne multitudine clauderentur* (Milt. 5. 4); *ne multitudine circumiretur* (Them. 3. 3).

To evaluate the high-water mark in each man's martial career, Nepos inserts an epilogue, the second epilogue

echoing the first, the two binding the lives together:

Qua pugna nihil adhuc exstitit nobilius; nulla enim umquam tam exigua manus tantas opes prostravit (Milt. 5. 5).

Sic unius viri prudentia Graecia liberata est Europaeque succubuit Asia. Haec altera victoria, quae cum Marathonio possit comparari tropaeo. Nam pari modo apud Salamina parvo numero navium maxima post hominum memoriam classis est devicta (Them. 5. 3).

Leo does not even mention the former epilogue, and he merely recognizes the existence of the latter. But two features of the second sentence of the latter epilogue attract special attention and make one suspect that Nepos strove to give it an impressive character. The first feature is the rhythmic character of the sentence, remarkable even in the work of a member of the Ciceronian school of clausula technique: the colon *Haec altera victoria*, after which one would pause in the reading aloud which was the general habit in antiquity, ends in choriamb plus cretic; and the sentence ends in cretic plus double trochee (*comparari tropaeo*) like the purple passage from the *Thrasybulus* quoted above (*clarissimae civitatis*). The second important feature is the omission of the copula in the first colon in token of a sententious utterance.⁶ Rhythmic and sententious form heightens the impressiveness of the statement and may cause the reader, as he pauses to reflect, to recall the epilogue to the first section of the *Miltiades*. The meaning of the sentence in English translation is perhaps best brought out by this version: "This is a second great victory—one that can be compared with the triumph at Marathon."⁷

It is possible that a poem on the sea-fight at Salamis attributed to Simonides was either directly or indirectly the common source of this epilogue and a portion of Plutarch's *Themistocles* (15. 2), which tells that the Greeks, as Simonides has said, won that splendid and renowned victory, excelled in glory

by no exploit of Greeks or Barbarians on the sea, thanks both to the common courage and spirit of those who manned the ships, and to the prudence and sagacity of Themistocles.

However, Plutarch does not explicitly give Themistocles credit for the liberation of Greece as does Nepos. Possibly Plutarch simply summarized the poem on Salamis rather accurately, while Nepos worked this source into both of the epilogues before us, calling Marathon (not, after the poem and like Plutarch, Salamis) a victory unsurpassed in glory, but then saying that Salamis could be compared with Marathon. Nepos, unlike Plutarch, maintains his naive emphasis upon the idealism of the resistance to Persia by saying nothing of the pre-battle bribery to which Themistocles was a party, and of his intense personal ambition (Plut. *Them.* 6. 1, 5. 2-3). Perhaps it was only through lack of acquaintance with the historical work of Stesimbrotus that Nepos did not, like Plutarch, follow him in recounting that Themistocles built up the Athenian navy over the public opposition of Miltiades (Plut. *Them.* 4. 3); for Nepos does not shrink from describing the antipathy between Themistocles and Aristides (*Arist.* 1. 1). But mentioning the conflict between Miltiades and Themistocles might have destroyed the unity of spirit existing between the two lives.

The next two corresponding sections of the lives deal respectively with the significant honorific portrayal of Miltiades in the Painted Porch (ch. 6) and, as Leo has written, the accomplishments of Themistocles in time of peace (chs. 6-7). Here again the motif of freedom harmonizes the corresponding sections: Miltiades is honored *quia Athenas totamque Graeciam liberarat* (6. 3); Themistocles, before the Spartan ephors, justly claims *urbem* (sc. *Athenas*) *ut propugnaculum oppositum esse barbaris, apud quam iam bis classes regias fecisse naufragium* (7. 5). The achievements of state and individual are extolled in chiasmic re-

lation in the respective lives: the epilogue to the first section of the *Miltiades* praises Athens, and Miltiades himself is honored later; this order is reversed in the *Themistocles*.

Next, Leo errs in seeing in the *Miltiades* an unbroken résumé of the hero's virtues demonstrated during three phases of his *akme*. For just as the *Themistocles* continues with the catastrophe of Themistocles' ostracism, flight, serving the Great King, and death (chs. 8-10), so Miltiades "because of his high-handed and unsuccessful expedition against Paros was prosecuted . . . , was sentenced to an enormous fine, and died in disgrace."⁸

Leo considers the concluding epilogues to the two lives to be of different types (p. 204). For in the *Miltiades* (ch. 8) there is an effort to pull the threads of the fabric together: Miltiades' just rule as *tyrannos* in the Chersonese and his array of virtues aroused the suspicion of the Athenians. But the *Themistocles*, he says, belongs to the class of those lives which conclude with brief notes on manner of death, grave, honors, vital statistics. But these portions of the lives actually exhibit an ironic parallelism involving freedom and oppression. One liberator, Miltiades, suffered from the suspicion of the Athenians he had benefited;⁹ the other, Themistocles, died guilty of treason but unsuccessful in aiding the enemy of the state he had made a first-rate naval power and had thus saved from that enemy:

Haec populus respiciens maluit illum innoxium plecti quam se diutius esse in timore (*Milt.* 8. 4). . . . neque (sc. Thucydides) negat fuisse famam, (sc. Themistoclem) venenum sua sponte sumpsisse, cum se, quae regi de Graecia opprimenda pollicitus est, praestare posse desperaret (*Them.* 10. 4).

Both men might be named Ichabod, Themistocles with even greater accuracy than Miltiades.

For all of Nepos' shortcomings as artist and historian, it gives pleasure

to observe how he presents the parallel lives of Miltiades and Themistocles.

PAUL R. MURPHY

Ohio University

NOTES

¹ Critical editions used were those of E. O. Winstedt (Oxford, 1904), A.-M. Guillemin (Paris, 1923), and H. Malcovati (Turin, 1934). The Loeb Classical Library edition of J. C. Rolfe includes the main textual variants.

² *Die griechisch-römische Biographie* (Leipzig, 1901) ch. 10.

³ Similarly Guillemin (p. viii) says that no other classical Latin author is so devoid of perfection of form.

⁴ Cf. *Timol.* 1. 1.

⁵ The *Miltiades* and the *Themistocles* contain seven such references each; no other life contains more than two.

⁶ B. Lupus, *Der Sprachgebrauch des Cornelius Nepos* (Berlin, 1876) p. 3, cites seven omissions of the copula, including this passage; but owing to the lack of reliable early MSS. of Nepos, editors have persisted in inserting the copula in many of these passages, often on very slender authority. In only three of these places do our four authorities agree in reading no copula:

Thras. 1. 4. 3. 2; *Att.* 3. 3. But omission of the copula is certainly a mark of Nepos' style: in addition to omitting it in sententious utterances, he omits it in the brief notices which introduce over half the lives (e.g., *Themistocles, Neocli filius, Atheniensis*); and that these notices are part of the body of the lives rather than titles is shown by their corresponding to complete sentences in the other lives (e.g., *Conon Atheniensis Peloponnesio bello accessit ad rem publicam. . .*). And so it is hard to understand why M^{ss} Malcovati agreed with Guillemin in reading *Haec est* after a lone fifteenth century MS. apparently belonging to the Paris group which Winstedt (*Praef.*) considered *parvi preti*, especially since Miss Malcovati (p. xxii) writes that she has taken Nepos' *ingenium* into account in choosing between variants.

⁷ A number of editors and translators use no punctuation immediately following *victoria*. But punctuation is needed to show that *quae . . . possit* is non-restrictive, being unnecessary for the explanation of *victoria*, which is used in the pregnant sense of "great victory"; and that only two victories, that of Marathon and that of Salamis, are implied.

⁸ W. K. Prentice, *The Ancient Greeks* (Princeton, 1940) p. 137.

⁹ W. W. How, *Journ. Hell. Stud.* 39 (1919) 61, finds the statements that Miltiades was sentenced because of Athenian fear of tyranny and that he died in prison unhistorical and added by Nepos for effect.

A Verbum Sesquipedale and the Grammarians

"Ripley's Believe It or Not" is more than occasionally of interest to classicists. The syndicated feature, as appearing in the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* (July 31, 1956), included the following: "The word FLOCCINAUCINIHIPIFICATION—meaning 'belittling'—contains the letter 'i' 9 times." More noteworthy than the frequency of appearance of the vowel 'i' in this truly ponderous and obviously learned vocable is the fact that it embraces almost all of the commonly listed *exempla* of a playful and pejorative use of the Latin genitive of value or price. Thus in the old Hale and Buck, *A Latin Grammar* (New York, 1903) p. 189, the second use of the Genitive of Value or Price is set down as follows: "Certain Substantives not used with serious meaning, especially *nihili*, 'zero,' *nauci*, 'a peascod,' *assis*, 'a copper,' *floci*, 'a straw,'

pili, 'a hair,' *huius*, 'that much' (with a snap of the finger)." Ripley's word has four of these six, all duly genitive: *floci*, *nauci*, *nihili*, *pili*, followed by the factitive suffix *-fication*. *Floccus*, *nihil*, and *pilus* are relatively common; *naucum* (or *naucus*), "peascod, shell of the pea-pod," is definitely uncommon and seemingly used exclusively for the evaluation of a person or thing as trifling or nugatory, usually in a negative construction. The Sto'lz-Schmalz *Lateinische Grammatik*, ed. 5 (München, 1928) pp. 400-401, adds *trioboli*, *terruncii*, *hettae*, *dupondii*. Of these, *hetta* (perhaps "a yawn," or otherwise "a bubble appearing on a loaf while baking") might well have attracted the erudite original coiner of Ripley's truly cyclopean vocable.

WILLIAM CHARLES KORFMACHER
Saint Louis University

We See by the Papers

GRAVES H. THOMPSON, EDITOR

AN ETYMOLOGICAL EXCURSION

The pleasures to be found in etymological excursions are evinced in a review by John Ciardi of Richard Wilbur's recent poetry. The article, entitled "Our Most Melodic Poet," appeared in the August 18 issue of *The Saturday Review*—and our thanks to Miss Marian West of St. Catherine's School in Richmond, Virginia, for bringing it to our attention.

Mr. Ciardi analyzes the following passage from Mr. Wilbur's "Things of This World":

Above their heads the maples with a stiff
Compliance entertain the air
In abrupt gusts, losing the look of trees
In rushed and cloudy metamorphoses,
Their shadows all a brilliant disrepair.

He concludes: "And there is a fourth, to me even more impressive quality, and that is exactly the one most readers would most likely overlook, and that is the Latin root-sense that shines through so much of Wilbur's diction. 'Compliance' means in current usage 'to yield to' but at root it means either (the derivation may be disputed either way) 'to fold up' or 'to be filled up with.' And whether one hears the root as *pliacare* or *plere* the root does function. So, even more clearly in 'entertain' (from the roots *inter* and *tenir*, 'to hold between'). The aptness of those root suggestions when applied to wind-blown trees and when juxtaposed to 'stiff' (itself—and this joyously derived from Latin *stipes* meaning 'a tree trunk or vegetable stalk') will illustrate how richly Wilbur works his diction in depth. One may slide over the surfaces paying no attention to these riches and find reward enough. Wilbur certainly is not the man to slug the reader into noticing his excellences. But they are there to be found. Nor is there any more valuable function the poet can perform than to reawaken the root sense of the language, to keep it a living instrument in the mouth of his people. As Valéry (I believe it was he) put it: 'To purify the language of his tribe.'"

GOVERNOR CLEMENT AND CONSUL CICERO

Whatever its intrinsic merits or demerits, the keynote speech of Governor Frank Clement of Tennessee before the Demo-

cratic National Convention was undoubtedly the liveliest set speech delivered at either of the national political conventions held last August. *Time* (August 20) noted that his speech "was charged with a rare potential of metaphor, simile, and alliteration, borrowed liberally from orators ranging from Cicero to Daniel Webster to Billy Graham."

Time goes on to quote Governor Clement's words: "How long, O how long shall these Republican outrages endure? How long, O how long will Americans permit the national welfare to be pounced upon at home and gambled abroad? How long, O how long will Republican roustabouts engage in a sideshow scramble for power and privilege?"

By way of comparison, the magazine then cites, in a footnote, the words of Cicero in the Roman Senate, 63 B.C.: "How far will you abuse our patience, Catiline? How long will this madness of yours make sport of us? How far will your insolence carry you?"

In sarcastic agreement, a *Time* reader (presumably a Republican) wrote in to say (September 3 issue of *Time*): "I point with pride to Governor Clement, whose speech was worthy of Cicero—Cicero, III."

Incidentally, the editor of this department can point with pride (unsarcastically) to Governor Clement as a former Latin student of his (at Cumberland University)—and an above average one, at that.

ROMAN BLOCKHOUSES IN LONDON

Time of August 6 tells the interesting story of new discoveries of Roman remains in the city of London:

"Many an archaeologist has eyed a handsome modern structure and secretly thought of what treasures he might find beneath it, if only somebody would blow it up. The German blitz on London in World War II provided just such an archaeologist's windfall, exposing ancient ruins sealed for centuries by the close-built modern city. Last week Director William Grimes of the London Museum described the discovery of two blockhouses which the Romans built either to protect Londinium, or to protect themselves from Londinium's people.

"Five years ago Grimes got interested in a kink in London's medieval wall near St. Giles Cripplegate Church in the downtown

'City' of London. It angles suggestively, as if it were enclosing something about 200 yards square. Grimes selected the site of some blitzed office buildings, dug a trench, and found the face of a solid wall made of Kentish ragstone, the Romans' favorite building material. Combined with the kink in the medieval wall, it outlined roughly a square Roman fort.

"Red tape delayed further digging for years. But at last the persistent Grimes got permission to dig in another nearby bomb site, selected a spot where he thought the systematic Romans would have built their usual turrets. Well below the modern surface, he found what he was looking for: two stone blockhouses about 25 ft. square. Between them ran a road divided by stone markers into two 8-ft. chariot-ways. The road had been surfaced three times. Grimes estimated that forts and road were built in A.D. 70-90, about the time of the Emperor Vespasian.

"Londinium's old Roman fort cannot be left on display as it is; land is too valuable in the heart of modern London. Grimes hopes that its stones will be put aside, then reassembled in some suitable place. This is being done with the Temple of Mithras that was found not far from the blockhouses [1954]. Its stones are waiting in a basement, carefully identified, while workers push construction of Bucklersbury House, a new business block. When it is finished, the temple will take shape again in the building's courtyard."

LEONIDAS REDIVIVUS

A grim item from D. William Blandford or Trinity School, Croydon, England, appeared in the London *Daily Mail* of August 24:

"Colonel George Grivas, the Cyprus terrorists' leader, flung back the surrender terms tonight and challenged the British: 'Come and get us.' . . .

"In replying 'Molon lave' ('Come and get us'), Grivas was repeating the words of the Greek hero Leonidas at the Pass of Thermopylae in Greece in 480 B.C. when the invading Persians called on Leonidas to surrender." (See Plutarch, *Moralia* 225 D.)

THE STOA OF ATTALOS

The reconstruction of the Stoa of Attalos by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens seems to have been well covered

by the American press. *Life*, for example, devoted eight pages of its September 17 issue to the subject.

Some papers, however, fell into the error of supposing that the original building was coeval with Athenians of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. The *Richmond Times-Dispatch* (Sept. 9) headed an editorial celebrating the occasion "Where Phidias and Socrates Walked"; though in the body of the article it appears to have been the market place of Athens, and not necessarily the Stoa, wherein these gentlemen walked.

The New York *Herald Tribune's* headline (Sept. 4) ran, "Socrates' Meeting Hall Rebuilt into a Museum." Below was a paragraph stating: "The Greeks dedicated here today the rebuilt Stoa of Attalos, one of the famous buildings of ancient Athens and a place where Socrates used to gather with his disciples." The same paper, four days later, printed a letter from Professor E. Adelaide Hahn of Hunter College which pointed out: "Attalos reigned, as the article itself correctly states, from 159 to 138 B.C. The date of Socrates' death was 399 B.C. So if in the Stoa of Attalos Socrates really 'used to gather with his disciples,' it could have been in spirit only. . . ."

GALILEO'S LATIN ANAGRAM

The New Yorker, in its "Talk of the Town" of July 7, carried a discussion of our close neighbor Venus (the planet, that is), which concluded:

"Galileo was . . . the first to realize that Venus was not at its brightest when it was closest to the earth, a fact confirming the Copernican theory that we were not, after all, at the center of the universe. Since such notions were unpopular with the Church, Galileo announced his discovery of the phases of Venus in a fiendishly clever Latin anagram, which read, '*Haec immatura a me iam frustra leguntur. oy.*' or 'These unripe things are now read by me in vain.' By juggling the letters one gets '*Cynthiae figuras aemulatur mater amorum.*' or 'The mother of love imitates the form of Cynthia.' Galileo expected his contemporaries to paraphrase this as 'Venus goes through the same phases as the moon.' Too deep for us."

Well, it might have helped to translate *figuras* as "forms," not "form." But what baffles us is the juggling.

Palaephatus — Pragmatic Mythographer

GEORGE F. OSMUN

THERE SEEMS TO BE a tendency prevalent at the present time to "debunk" our national myths and legends. Newspapers and history books delight in pointing out that George Washington never cut down the cherry tree (and hence was capable of prevarication) and that Davy Crockett's family life was less than exemplary. This way of thinking was not alien to the ancient Greeks, who not only sought to rationalize their myths and legends, but also to offer a pragmatic solution for their origin. One of the less well-known of these pragmatic mythographers was Palaephatus.¹

Although Palaephatus is mentioned by at least ten ancient writers, we have very little reliable information about his life. He probably lived during the fourth century and wrote about 320 B.C. or slightly later. He wrote a work entitled *Peri Apiston, On Things Incredible*, in five books. What has come down to us is but a corrupted abridgment of the first part of the larger work. This is obvious from many considerations: first, because Suidas speaks of it as consisting of five books; secondly, because many ancient writers refer to Palaephatus for statements that are not found in the treatise now extant;² and thirdly, because the MSS. exhibit it in various forms.

It contains a proemium and 52 fables with an explanation of them. Numbers 46-52 are Byzantine additions which are contained in only one group of MSS. and do not belong thematically with the preceding. The book was rarely mentioned by pagan writers, but always with approval and interest (Vergil, *Ciris* 88 speaks of *docta Palaephata testatur voce papyrus*).³ It appealed particularly to Christian writers who believed that the so-called natural ex-

planations could root out pagan superstitions. Its simple, easy style and amusing, instructive contents made it a popular reading-book in teaching the elements of the Greek language even up into the 19th century, especially in Germany and in England.

Although as a writer Palaephatus is of secondary rank, he is interesting as being one of the few extant representatives of a particular approach to mythology. The treatment of this science in ancient times passed through various phases. Mythology was at first treated incidentally as being a branch of genealogy, history or philosophy. The first mythological authors known to us are Xenophanes (6th century B.C.), a philosopher who attacked polytheism and anthropomorphism, and a Milesian, Hecataeus, who wrote toward the end of the sixth century four books of *Genealogies*. Theagenes of Rhegium (fl. 525 B.C.) was an allegorist who attempted to show by an examination of their names that the gods were personifications of moral qualities or natural elements. Also writing during the sixth century were Acousilaus, Pherecydes and Hellanicus, all of whom were interested in myth primarily in its relation to the traditions of families and of cities.

The second phase comprises those writers who treated mythology as a science *per se*. This involved an analysis of the myths according to either a rationalistic or a pragmatic standpoint. Although it is difficult to trace its development, rationalism may be said to have begun with the poets who changed or altered the myths for literary purposes. It was continued by the poetic philosophers, such as Stesichorus and Xenophanes and by the historians toward the end of the sixth century B.C. These early writers soon adopted the viewpoint that a myth does

Presented at the CAMWS meeting in Lexington, 1956.

not mean what it appears to mean. This led naturally to two interpretations: the pragmatic and the allegorical. The latter may be subdivided further into the physical in which the gods were equated with natural elements (as in Theagenes and Metrodorus) and the moral in which the gods were equated with moral qualities (as in Protagoras, Prodicus of Ceos, and Socrates). The allegorical method was confined, for the most part, to the philosophers, especially to the Stoics and to the Cynics. The pragmatic method grew out of the half-historical approach as found in Herodotus and Herodorus,⁴ although it later gained favor with the Peripatetics. It would be most harmonious with their view that speculation must be based on experience of reality and systematic research.⁵

The most famous name among the pragmatic writers is that of Euhemerus who advanced the theory that the gods of mythology had their origin in kings or heroes deified by those whom they had ruled over or benefited. To this school belong Palaephatus and Heraclitus, the latter of whom is credited with being the author of both a *Peri Apiston* and *Allēgoriai Homērikai*. The anonymous *Excerpta Vaticana* belong to this genre.⁶

The Hellenistic Age ushered in a third treatment which had as its object not the interpretation or integration of the myths, but simply the compiling of them. Here we find handbooks on myths of various types of which Eratosthenes' *Catasterismi*, giving the legends of the different constellations, and Parthenius' *Peri Erotikōn Pathēmáton*, a collection of erotic myths prepared for the use of the elegiac poet Cornelius Gallus, are representative. The *magnum opus* of this type is, of course, the *Bibliothékē* or *Library* of Apollodorus. Other writers of these mythological reference books whose works have been spared the obliteration if not the ravages of time are Conon (c. 40

B.C.) and Antoninus Liberalis (perhaps 2nd century A.D.). The Romans continued the Greek passion for collecting, the most well-stocked storehouses being those of Hyginus and of Ovid.

It is obviously impossible here to trace the attitude toward myth further than this. The Renaissance with its boundless enthusiasm and amazing flexibility found it perfectly possible to combine all of the treatments of the ancients and to interpret a fable literally, morally, and allegorically. Mythological handbooks multiplied, many of them, like Cartari's *Images of the Gods*, intended for the use of artists and sculptors. Most of them are a curious blend of Greek, Oriental, and Hebraic symbolism. The modern scholar has added the philological, anthropological, and psychological interpretations and the *soi-disant* "scientific." The latter method is best illustrated by Robert Graves in his Penguin edition of *The Greek Myths* where he writes: "The historical and anthropological approach is the only reasonable one." Thus, we have come full circle and are back with our pragmatist Palaephatus.

Perhaps the latter's explanations are somewhat more fanciful than are Graves', but the aim is similar—to reduce the myth to its naked essence, to explain its origin, and to free the world forever from chimeras. This is a noble enterprise and it is gratifying to see modern scholars emulating their Alexandrian prototypes, but in all fairness it must be noted that the myths in all their beauty and mystery are still omnipresent whereas the works of Palaephatus are all but unknown.

It is difficult to speak about Palaephatus' style, since what we now possess is probably an epitome of the original. In its use as a schoolbook up until the Byzantine Age the work must have undergone manifold changes. The safest method will be merely to comment on what we have. The 45 chapters of the preserved book reveal very little

about the person of the author. The language is "Everyday Greek" which gives no clue to the time or school connection of the writer.

In his preface Palaephatus, if it is indeed he speaking, says: "And in my travels through many countries I inquired of old men what they had heard about each of these stories and I write here what I learned from them. And I personally visited as many countries as I could, and I have written these things down not as they were told to me, but as I myself have learned by travel and research." The purpose of the work is stated as follows: "But as for me, I think that everything which has been narrated happened. For if they were merely names, no story would have come into being about them. But first the deed occurred and then the story about it." Again I cannot resist quoting from Robert Graves (Introduction, p. 20): "Yet myths, though difficult to reconcile with chronology, are always practical: they insist on some point of tradition, however distorted the meaning may have become in the telling." In this prologue Palaephatus also states his principle: "For as many sights and forms as are said to have existed, which do not exist now, so many did not exist then. For if anything once existed at another time, it exists now also and will exist again."

The myths analysed are all known from other sources and seldom (cf. 13) does one encounter an uncommon version. Variants are sometimes noted, but no authorities or sources are ever cited. They are short and concise. The longest contains about 500 words, the shortest 35. The average myth runs to about 16 lines or slightly over 100 words. They may have been grouped originally according to subject matter. If so, the order has been confused by the epitomist.⁷ The myth is presented in a few sentences without literary embellishment of any kind. Then comes the refutation which is frequently thrice as long as the statement of the myth.

The style is repetitious to the point of monotony, although there is some attempt at variety.

Palaephatus' pragmatic explanations of the myths may be divided somewhat arbitrarily into four categories: the logical explanation (8 cases), the onomastic (15), the etymological (4), and the metaphorical (18). Some of them, such as that of Phorcy's daughters, may contain elements of several types.

The logical explanation is based primarily on the application of common sense to explain stories which have been exaggerated through misunderstanding or *errores credulitatis*. For instance, the Amazons were really barbarian men, but they wore long chitons reaching to the feet like the Thracians, drew back their hair with snoods and were smooth-shaven, hence they were called "women" by their enemies. The logical explanation is frequently used to account for the metamorphoses of men and women into animals. While hunting, Atalanta and Melanion entered a cave for reasons similar to those of Dido and Aeneas. The cave was the den of a lion and lioness which were routed by the human voices. When Melanion's attendants saw the beasts emerge, they concluded (probably from a safe distance) that the couple had been metamorphosed. Why the story persisted after the human lovers turned up, Palaephatus fails to explain. Heracles solves this problem by definitely stating that the lovers were eaten by the beasts. The story of Callisto is so short that it may be quoted entire.

The story about Callisto is that while hunting she became a bear. But I say that she went into a certain thicket where there happened to be a bear which caught and ate her up. Her fellow huntsmen, seeing her go in and not come out again, said that the girl had become a bear.

This explanation calls to mind the rhyme,

Algy saw a bear.
The bear was bulgy;
The bulge was Algy.

The story of Glaucus is similar, but

somewhat more credible. Glaucus was a fisherman who excelled all other men in swimming. One day he was swimming in the harbor and swam to a certain spot beyond the sight of the people and disappeared. When he returned several days later, the villagers asked, "Where were you so many days?" and he jokingly replied, "In the sea." His fame was increased by another seemingly fabulous exploit. He secretly shut up fish in a reservoir and, when a storm arose which prevented the other fishermen from making a catch, he asked the citizens whether they wished him to catch some fish for them. When he had caught what they wanted, the citizens were so filled with wonder and admiration that they henceforth called him "son of the sea." But one day while swimming he met a sea beast and lost his life and, when he did not return from the sea, the legend grew that he was living there.

The last logical refutation to be mentioned is that of Medea because it illustrates how cursory and superficial is Palaephatus' treatment of the myths. Medea's magical power of rejuvenating men is explained by the fact that she dyed their hair and gave them steam baths. Pelias, a feeble, old man, died of the treatment. Note that Palaephatus carefully ignores those aspects of the myth which do not fit his explanation and that he passes over the many other incredible aspects of the Medea legend in silence.

Under the term onomastic or appellative are grouped those myths which are explained by means of a name. This philological weapon is very handy for ridding the world of monsters. Scylla is merely the name of a pirate ship which Odysseus escaped by means of tribute and a favorable wind. Europa was abducted by a man named "Bull." (A dry humor is not lacking in Palaephatus. About Europa he remarks: "But I do not think either a bull or a horse could swim so far nor a girl ride a wild bull. And if Zeus wanted Eu-

ropa to come to Crete, he would have found a more pleasant means of transportation.") The same solution applies to the story of Pasiphaë. Bellerophon's Pegasus was a swift trireme and the Chimera was a mountain whose two approaches were guarded by a lion and by a serpent respectively. Bellerophon burned out the mountain and killed the beasts. Alopex was a "Fox" only insofar as his nature exhibited the sly cunning of this creature. Ceto was a "Sea-monster" only in the sense that Blackbeard and Jean Lafitte were. The Hydra was not a serpent with fifty heads, but the name of a town. Heracles was sent by king Eurystheus to capture the town which was guarded by a tower whereon stood fifty archers. Whenever one was struck and fell, two rose up in his place. Heracles finally set fire to the tower and pillaged the town despite the efforts of Carcinus ("Crab"), a huge, warlike man who had come to Lernus' relief. Examples could be multiplied—dragons are really villains named Draco, three-headed freaks such as Geryon or Cerberus are inhabitants of a city named Trikarenia and the literal-minded, upon hearing the name, supposed that they were thus endowed. Aeolus was merely an astronomer.⁸

Although the foregoing examples are really etymological in nature, this category has been reserved for those myths in which the philological explanation is basic to the *lusis*. The best example is that of the Centaurs. When Ixion was king of Thessaly the country was plagued by herds of wild cattle. Some young archers from a village called Nephele trained horses (which had previously been used only for drawing wagons) and riding on their backs went out and destroyed the bulls with javelins. From this event arose the tale that Ixion was the father by Nephele (Cloud) of a race of beings called Kentauroi (Bullstickers) who were a mixture of man and horse.

Another example of this type is the

story about the Sphinx. She was not a monster, but an Amazon (Palaephatos forgets that elsewhere he makes the Amazons men), the wife of Cadmus. After Cadmus killed Draco ("Dragon"), he took Draco's sister Harmonia as his wife. Moved by jealousy Sphinx persuaded many of the citizens to join her in a revolt against Cadmus. Taking Cadmus' money and swift-footed hunting dog, she hurried to a nearby mountain and from there declared war upon Cadmus. Also, she laid an ambush in which she seized many of Cadmus' men. Now the Thebans call an ambush a "riddle" (*ainigma*), so they used to say: "The savage Sphinx is destroying us, sitting on the mountain and hiding herself in a riddle. No one is able to discover the riddle and it is impossible to fight openly. For they don't run but they fly, both woman and dog." Oedipus, who was an experienced soldier and had a fast horse, found the riddle (i.e., the ambush) and killed Sphinx. A similar explanation is given to account for the story of the wooden horse. The "hollow" refers not to the wooden horse, but to a ravine near the city where the Greeks hid until they could enter by the breach in the walls. The apples of the Hesperides were really sheep due to a confusion about the Greek words *mêlon*. Heracles stole them after killing the shepherd Draco ("Dragon"). They were "golden" because their wool was valuable. Hence the myth.

The metaphorical refutation is perhaps the most obvious and, possibly for that reason, is most popular with Palaephatos. The story of Actaeon being eaten by his dogs is typical. This myth is the literal interpretation of the idea that Actaeon spent all his money on hunting dogs and thus was metaphorically "eaten up" by the expense of his hounds. The same explanation holds true for Phineus. The Harpies who snatched away his food were his extravagant, wasteful daughters who reduced him to penury. Diomedes' and

Glaucus' horses were man-eaters in the same sense. Niobe was not turned to stone, but her statue was set up on her children's tomb. Passersby used to say: "Stone Niobe is standing on the tomb. We saw her." So even now we often say: "I sat down near the bronze Heracles" or near "marble Hermes." Heracles was not a slave to Omphale in the literal sense; he was her slave "in love." Io did not become a cow; she "ran like a cow stung by a gadfly." Lynceus could not see beneath the earth; he was the first miner and his "eyes" were lamps. Zethus and Amphion built the walls of Thebes with a lyre. But the stones did not leap into place animistically; they were put there by men who agreed to labor on the wall for the pleasure of hearing these skilled musicians. Similarly, the trees did not follow Orpheus in dendrological procession. He was a cithara player who was hired to lead the Bacchants down from the hills. They followed him bearing in their hands their ivy-twined thyrsi and wands, so that they had the appearance of a wondrous forest ("Fear not, till Birnam wood, Do come to Dunsinane").

A few of Palaephatos' fables in their entirety will present an idea of his style or, rather, of its almost complete absence. I have consciously striven in my translation to reproduce the simple, laconic manner of the original Greek.

Pandora

The story that they moulded earth to give form to Pandora and to others seems to me to be insufferable. Pandora was a woman, the richest in Greece, and when she went out in public she arrayed herself splendidly and smeared herself with a lot of earth. For she first invented the fashion of smearing her skin with a lot of earth (as even now many women do, but no one is mentioned by name because the majority do it). The fact was thus. The story altered it to the impossible.

If Pandora was the prototype of Elizabeth Arden, Daedalus was an innovator in the field of art.

Daedalus⁹

It is said about Daedalus that he set up statues of himself which walked. I personally think this is impossible for a statue to walk of its own accord. The truth is this. The makers of statues and images used to fashion the hands and feet side by side as though growing together. But Daedalus first made the one foot stepping forward. For this reason men used to say, "Daedalus made this statue walk, not stand," just as even now we say "fighting men have been drawn" and we speak of "running horses" and a "tempest-tost ship," so they said he made "walking statues."

The Horn of Amalthea

They say that Heracles carried about everywhere a horn called the horn of Amalthea from which poured forth for him whatever he desired. The truth is this. While Heracles was traveling abroad through Boeotia with his brother's son Iolaus, he lodged in Thespieae at a certain inn where the hostess happened to be a young and very beautiful woman named Amalthea. Heracles was pleased with her and prolonged his stay. Iolaus was impatient and contrived to steal Amalthea's profits stored in a horn, from which he bought whatever he wished for himself and for Heracles. Therefore, their fellow travelers said, "Heracles has Amalthea's horn from which he gets whatever he wishes." From this, then, the myth was exaggerated and writers who write about Heracles speak of "Amalthea's horn."

Does the pragmatic method have any real value and is Palaephatus an author of such worthlessness as to justify the neglect into which his book has fallen? His *a priori* assumption that things which do not exist have never existed is obviously unsound and the theory that historical fact is the foundation of every fiction is nonsense. As H. J. Rose has pointed out,¹⁰ the pragmatic method appeals to a type of mind which is utterly incapable of realizing how simple people think. A woman cannot be turned into a stone or a tree, therefore stories of this sort must be the result of misunderstanding or trickery. Thus, pragmatism is valuable only insofar as legendary details are often added to historical fact.

Yet, Blumenthal is somewhat too severe in his judgment that Palaephatus'

little book because of its unspeakably flat rationalism is meaningful today only as an example of a scarcely comprehensible phase of ancient thought. The proof that this literal, pseudo-scientific type of thought existed among the ancients is not without interest in itself. It found adherents and it is almost unnecessary to note that the Palaephatean method is the basis of much modern biblical exegesis.¹¹

Secondly, although he applies his method too naively and exclusively, the basic procedure is not without value and has a specious attractiveness. As Grote remarks (*History of Greece*, vol. 1, pp. 252 ff.):

He neither credulously believes the current narratives nor does he summarily dismiss them. . . . His aim is rather to show that the extra-analogical features of the stories are to be ascribed to the poets, to rumor or to misunderstanding. Accordingly, he has taken great pains to separate the true from the false. He handles the myths consistently and by his conjectures we get out of the impossible and arrive at matter intrinsically plausible, if uncertified.

Lastly, although it is perhaps impossible for us to pass on the question, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that Palaephatus was the originator of the pragmatic method. We are not certain when Euhemerus' *Hiera Anagraphé* was published. If we accept the date 280 B.C. for the appearance of this work, it is quite possible that Palaephatus was the innovator. It is just as possible that he was but one of many voices now lost in the rationalizing current of the period. Even if he is to be dated chronologically after Euhemerus, his method is basically different from that of the former. Euhemerus is concerned with the gods; there is no evidence that Palaephatus ever mentions them. It is true that scattered traces of a pragmatic approach to myth may be found in authors antedating Palaephatus. Although the 35 extant fragments

of Hecataeus seem to be merely geographical, numbers 26 and 27 embody a rationalistic explanation. Herodotus 1. 122, 2. 55-57 and 3. 18 are pragmatic in tone.¹² Examples from other writers could easily be adduced. But Palaephatus is the first writer, so far as we now know, to apply the pragmatic method to a detailed study of mythology and to compile a handbook of the results. That he was imitated by later writers is probable from the works of Heraclitus who is usually dated in the first century A.D. (if, indeed, the fragments of the Codex Vaticanus 350 are to be assigned to him) and from the *Excerpta Vaticana*.

In the present age when pragmatism in various fields has gained such wide acceptance, Palaephatus deserves renewed reading and careful evaluation both for his virtues and his limitations.

University of Texas

NOTES

¹ The editions of Palaephatus I have used are *Palaephati Peri Apiston*, ed. Nicolaus Festa (*Mythographi Graeci*, vol. 3, part 2 [Leipzig, 1902]) and *Palaephati Incredibilia*, ed. M. Paulus Pater (Hungary, 1886). For discussions cf. Fridericus Wipprecht, *Quaestiones Palaephataeae*, Diss. Heidelberg (Bonn, 1892) and Johannes Schrader, *Palaephataeae* (Berlin, 1894). F. Wipprecht, *Zur Entwicklung der Rationalistischen Mythendeutung bei den Griechen*, Progym. Donaueschingen

(Tubingen, 1902) presents an excellent study of the development of the pragmatic treatment of mythology. A summary appears in F. Susenhiel, *Geschichte der Griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1892) pp. 54-57.

² They are collected and analysed by Wipprecht, *Q. P.*, pp. 13 ff.

³ This citation is questionable, however. It first appears in the Aldine edition of 1517. Many editors print *Palaephataeae* . . . *Pachynus*.

⁴ Fr. 18 of Herodorus explains that Apollo and Poseidon did not build the walls of Troy, but that Laomedon built them with money taken from the treasures of the temples of these gods. Wipprecht calls attention to the interesting fact that this same explanation in Eustathius (in Od. 1, p. 1382, 47 ff.) is ascribed to Palaephatus and is found related in almost the same words in *Excerpta Vaticana* 4 (Festa, p. 89).

⁵ Schrader points out that Palaephatus' interest in natural history, inventions, and ancient customs was also shared by the Peripatetics.

⁶ The 39 brief fables attributed to Heraclitus and the 23 anonymous *Excerpta Vaticana* are included in Festa's edition of Palaephatus. This slim volume comprises all that remains of the pragmatic mythographers.

⁷ Schrader, pp. 15-17 endeavors to reconstruct the original order.

⁸ Cf. Eur. *Helen* 489 ff. where Menelaus suggests that there may be a man named Zeus living in Egypt.

⁹ Cf. Plato, *Euth.* 11 C.

¹⁰ H. J. Rose, *A Handbook of Greek Mythology* (New York, 1928) p. 4.

¹¹ For an example of a contemporary application of the Palaephatean method, cf. L. G. Pocock's explanation of Scylla in *The Landfalls of Odysseus* (Christchurch, 1955) p. 12.

¹² Wipprecht, *E. R. M.*, pp. 20-38 argues that Hecataeus, like Pherecydes and Acousilaus, uses the historical method rather than the pragmatic, and that Herodotus so divorces the stories from the miraculous that they can no longer be classified as myths. Herodotus has almost discarded the *Volks Glaube* and accepted the Euhemeristic concept of the heroes as mortals.

Catullus 3

Be blue, every Venus and Cupid
and every sophisticate man;
my sweetheart has lost her sparrow,
her little sparrow has died.
She loved it more than her eyes.
It knew her, this mellow sparrow,
as well as my girl knew her mother;
it never moved from her bosom,
but hopped about here and there

and chirped to its only mistress.

But now it travels the shadows
to the realm from which none return.
Be damned, you damnable shadows
that swallow all beauty for Hell:
you took such a beautiful sparrow.
O pitiless crime! pitied sparrow!
For you, now, my sweetheart's eyes
are swollen and red as she cries.

ROY A. SWANSON

Indiana University

BOOK REVIEWS

FRED W. HOUSEHOLDER, JR., EDITOR

The Life and Times of Nero. By CARLO MARIA FRANZERO. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1956. Pp. 334; 12 plates. \$4.75.

FROM THE TITLE and publisher of this work the casual bookstore browser might easily suppose that he was buying a life and times of Nero. A quick thumb-through would confirm the assumption. A bibliography, an index, and a dozen plates (some of these very good) are the normal stigmata of scholarly-popular biography. The Philosophical Library has a certain reputation in the general field of literary and linguistic reference books. The jacket blurb speaks of "a realistic and authentic biography . . . at variance with the many imaginative versions already created in the public mind."

Anyone who allows himself to be taken for \$4.75 on the strength of the above come-on must console himself with what of stoicism he can command. He will have purchased, in fact, a fictionalized mosaic rather uncritically pieced together from Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio Cassius, with a thick cement supplied by Mr. Franzero. Fair enough if thus advertised: so and not otherwise are historical novels confected. But it must be added that this work lacks the literary skill and creative imagination of *I, Claudius* and *Claudius the God*, as well as the romantic excitement of *Quo Vadis*. The author has fallen unhappily between the two stools of sticking accurately to his sources and of giving a rip-roaring invention of his own. Of course no treatment could make Nero actually dull; but this reviewer, for one, prefers both his history and his fiction straight, or blended, if blending is inevitable, by a more magic hand.

One of Franzero's better devices is a running commentary on Nero's pleasant follies in the form of a series of "newsletters" from Gaius Petronius at Rome to his friend Marcus Valerius rustivating in a provincial town. These reports have some of the flavor of cynical wit that enlivens the letters of Caelius Rufus to Cicero (*Ad Familiares* 8), and some of the dead-pan realism and shock-proof detachment that one might expect from the *Arbiter Elegantiae* (with the Tacitus text before him, Mr. Franzero gives us *Arbiter Elegantiarum*) and author of the *Satyricon*. But this is hardly enough to re-

deem the essentially uninspired scissors-and-paste work that makes the bulk of the volume.

JOHN H. COLLINS

New York City

Some Greek Poems of Love and Nature. Translated into English verse by J. M. EDMONDS. Cambridge: Deighton Bell, 1955. Pp. 92. 7/6.

LABORS OF LOVE, even when they escape labor pains, all too often are lost; it would be a pity for such a lovely labor as this of Mr. Edmonds' to be lost. Everyone knows, of course, that you cannot translate, and yet we all do, more or less secretly. Translations must be made; even the most accomplished of classical scholars were often introduced to the Classics while still boys through translations, whether through ponies, interlinears, or, perhaps more fortunately, through such felicitous versions as these of Mr. Edmonds. For some, linguistic facility became such that they learned to do without translations—and yet many of us either keep trying to translate, to imitate the inimitable, or at least we study carefully someone who has translated one of our favorite poems. No matter how short we may feel any translation to be of the original, we must never become so fastidious as to forget the reader who cannot go to the original, both the adult reader who will probably never go now, and the youth who may be turned to the Classics through the beauty he has seen in a translation.

For all these classes of readers Mr. Edmonds' delightful anthology has something to offer. In fact, it is able to teach some contemporary poets what can still be done with rhyme and meter and rhetoric. From the ingenious and justified Chaucerian version of Semonides' satire on women to the Christina Rossetti-like epitaph of Phileas, there is an abundance of small riches.

Examples of Mr. Edmonds' happy knack for translating in many of the various degrees of freedom permitted to, and often required of, the translator are numerous. I choose from his selection by the same personal standard which he used for his original selection. Palladas A.P. 11. 300 he

renders as literally as one can, commensurate with the exigencies of verse:

You talk too much, my fellow-man,
Soon in the grave to lie;
Hold your tongue, and while you can,
Practise how to die.

On the other hand, he can vary the Greek plainness with a touching turn which brings out the peculiarly plaintive note Palladas so often strikes (A.P. 10. 84):

Weeping I die, as weeping I was born,
And found me much to weep for all
my days;
O men, that come so tearful, weak, forlorn,
And so forlorn, weak, tearful go
your ways!

Even so colorless a distich as Theognis 527 (*Anthologica Lyrica* ed. Diehl) takes on just enough coloring to make it live in English; the cold, almost barren simplicity of much classic verse, though moving in the original, often appears frigid in English, as so much of Landor.

Cry woe for Age, for Youth cry woe,
That one doth come and 'tother go.

The Elizabethan echo in "Cry woe" creates a delicately sad and delicately antique mood which the slight effect of "doth" and "'tother" follows and enhances. One should, in analyzing, note also how the chiasmic arrangement of the first line is balanced by the utterly simple and direct statement of the second.

Mr. Edmonds' version of "The Rhodian Swallow-Song," which he takes from his Loeb Library edition of *Lyra Graeca* (3. 526), is so good that it can stand as an original poem. Its freedoms in translation are few and felicitous; the metrical variety delicate and appropriate; and the general effect of a song nearly perfect.

See! see! the Swallow is here!
She brings a good season, she brings
a good year;
White is her breast and black her crest,
See the Swallow is here.

Ho! roll a fruit-cake from your
well-fill'd cot,
Of cheese a fair round, of wine a
full pot;
Porridge she'll take, and a bite
of hardbake;
She never despises good cheer.

Go we away empty today?
An thou wilt give us, we'll up and away;
But an thou deny us, O here we shall stay.

Shall we take your door and your
lintel also,
Shall we take the good wife that is
sitting below?
She's not so tall but we'll lift her
and all—
We can easily bear her away.

If you give us but little, then God send
you more;
The Swallow is here! come, open
the door;
No graybeards you'll see, but children
are we;
So we pray you to give us good cheer.

Perhaps the only criticism that one can make of the anthology is that a few pieces seem too insignificant to merit translation, such as the fragment from Archilochus with which the volume opens. Without some awareness of their historical context, such pieces are flat and, almost, meaningless. But even these pieces contribute to the bouquet of the anthology; and those who prefer roses to bluets do not despise the latter.

The volume is nearly uniform with its two predecessors in the series *Little Things of Greek Poetry* published in 1937 and 1939 under the titles *Some Greek Poems of Love and Beauty* and *Love and Wine*. There are brief notes and an excellent index so that the reader will be able to find the originals in any one of a number of standard collections. Other indices give the dates of the poet and source of the poems and first words in English and Greek. The editor refers readers to the introduction of the first volume for an account of the poets and their work. A fourth volume, to include "more love-poems, the great epitaphs and other poems of remembrance," is to follow.

JOHN CROSSETT

Harvard University

The Metalogicon of John of Salisbury.
Translated by DANIEL D. MCGARRY. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1955.
Pp. 305. \$5.00.

THANKS TO MR. MCGARRY, there now remains to be translated into English the equivalent of no more than two small volumes of John of Salisbury's works. Among these, all minor works, are the letters written after 1161 and the short biographies of Anselm and Thomas Becket. (Other works included in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 199, are *De septem septenis* and *Carmen de membris conspirantibus*.) The translation of John's most copious effort, *Policraticus, sive de nugis curialium et vestigiis philoso-*

phorum, has been shared by John Dickinson (*The Statesman's Book of John of Salisbury* . . . [New York, 1927]; books 4-6 and parts of books 7 and 8) and Joseph B. Pike (*Frivolities of Courtiers and Footprints of Philosophers* . . . [Minneapolis, 1938]; books 1-3 and the hitherto untranslated portions of books 7 and 8, including the *Entheticus de dogmate philosophorum*). Recent additions to Nelson's *Medieval Texts* (Latin original and English translation) include the first half of the two-volume Milior-Butler-Brooke edition and translation of the letters and M. Chibnall's edition and translation of the *Historia Pontificalis*.

The complete translation of the *Metalogicon* (*libri IIII*) brings to the English language, then, the second major work of this humanist whom no recent critic has praised as less than "the most notable representative of that revival of learning which gave the title of 'mediaeval renaissance' to the twelfth century" (Hans Liebeschütz, *Mediaeval Humanism in the Life and Writings of John of Salisbury* [London, 1950] p. 1). We remember John of Salisbury, of course, as the scholar whose refreshing intelligence produced a wealth of such comments as "I do not claim that Aristotle is always correct in his views and teaching, as though everything he has written were sacrosanct." Or, "Because of its introductory nature, Porphyry's work is entitled the *Isagogae*. But its very name is contradicted by those who become so engrossed in it that they leave no time for the principal essentials, on which the whole significance of the introductory work depends." Or again, "Despite the fact that this new Cornificius is less clever than the old one, a host of fools follow him. It is a motley crowd, made up mostly of the lazy and dull, who are trying to seem, rather than to become wise."

The introduction to this translation, of which the above quotations are samples, consists of biographical, textual and analytical details which are pleasantly brief. Perhaps too brief: no mention is made of John's defense of Nominalism based upon his interpretation of Aristotle. But Mr. McGarry rightly characterizes the *Metalogicon* as a "pedagogical classic" which "summarizes and argues convincingly on behalf of the thorough study of" the *trivium* (grammar, logic, rhetoric). He might (should, it seems to me, in a general introduction) have added that the argument entails an abhorrence of the academic specialist; for example: "By itself, logic is practically useless. Only when it is associated with other studies does logic shine. . . ."

The "starting point for most of this translation" has been Clement C. J. Webb's critical edition. The translator provides for the Webb text 21 emendations, a number of which are borne out by the Canterbury, *De Bello* and St. Alban codices. The quotations used in the second and third paragraphs of this review are indicative of Mr. McGarry's success in striving for clarity and readability. More questionable, however, is his translation of *criminatur* by "he yaps" (p. 242) and his presentation of Philology, "sister" to Philosophy and Philology, as antecedent to "it" (*que*) on p. 247 and to "her" (*que*) on p. 248.

I should like to provide a few emendations for the translator's text. The spellings, "enuntiation" (p. 100) and "overweaning" (p. 206) are needlessly variant. Nor should "premisses" on p. 208 have to contend with "premises" on p. 209. And of the 71 words set in Greek type face, 16 are afflicted with such distractions as misplaced accent, wrong or absent breathing, wrong case, or misspelling (see p. xxi and compare footnote Prologue, 21; see footnotes I. 335, III. 180, IV. 48, 60, 62, 202, 205, 244, 335 [compare Webb text], 366, 392).

ROY ARTHUR SWANSON

Indiana University

The Philosophy of Epictetus. By JOHN BONFORTE. New York: The Philosophical Press, 1955. Pp. xiv, 146. \$3.00.

"Well stored with pious frauds, and, like most discourses of the sort, much better calculated for the private advantage of the preacher than the edification of the hearers." Thus saith Edmund Burke.

Mr. Bonforte, wittingly or not, has done a serious injustice to the ethical standards of modern publication. His slender volume, containing some of the most exalted of the sayings of the great Stoic, is a cento of slightly reworked excerpts from Thomas Wentworth Higginson's excellent revision of the admirable eighteenth-century translation of Elizabeth Carter. The plan (p. ix) to "give the present-day, hurried reader an opportunity of reading the philosophy of Epictetus with a minimum of effort," despite the suggestion (p. xi) "that this book be read slowly," is to divide the *Discourses* into chapters according to subject matter and to reduce the pagination to less than one third the length of Mr. Higginson's version. This is accomplished in one hundred and sixteen numbered selections which vary in length from half a page to several pages. The total absence of headings, index, and table of contents, however, leaves the

reader completely mystified. Apparently Chapters I through IX deal with God and His relation to man; Chapters X through XIII with God's gifts, the Faculties; Chapters XIV through XXII with philosophy; and thereafter sundry examples of human behavior and problems (e.g. Chapters LIX through LXVI concern Life and Death). It would be generous to assume that perhaps one eighth of the thoughts in the *Discourses* are thus represented.

Closer scrutiny from cover to cover produces some shocking revelations. The opening page of the *Preface* is flagrantly cribbed without acknowledgment almost *verbatim* from Higginson's *Preface*, from which Mr. Bonforte quotes liberally, with acknowledgment, on the following page. His admission of knowing "not a word of Greek" (p. ix) is acceptable until one finds him admitting on the same page the taking of liberties with Mr. Higginson. One must then approach the text with suspicions aroused. The truth, however, does not become immediately clear. Mr. Bonforte is presenting, as he says, the thoughts, not the words of Epictetus. But suddenly the reader who knows Epictetus realizes that something is happening to the Stoicism, something which happened (with acknowledgment) many centuries ago. Here is a modern attempt similar to the famous reworking of the *Encheiridion*, known to scholars as the *Christian Paraphrase*. Like his medieval predecessor Mr. Bonforte excises Zeus and the gods in favor of a consistent rendering "God." This is perhaps not a serious matter. When he casually tampers with technical terminology such as the use of the word "Will" in Chapter I for Higginson's "the use of external impressions," he is not wrong, I suppose, but he certainly is subtly attaining an end pointed toward equating Stoicism with Christianity, rather than comparing the two.

The progress of the reading becomes increasingly hampered by the maniacal use of the comma. This led the present reviewer to resort to a complete examination of Mr. Higginson's work to find out if this were the perpetuation of some nineteenth-century eccentricity of style. Unfortunately for Mr. Bonforte, such did not prove to be the case. He occasionally omits necessary punctuation, but much more frequently inserts it to the complete destruction of sense. For but one example, on page 116 one reads, "Why, did we appoint you, tutor of the cook, man?" The second comma is Mr. Bonforte's contribution. The first one is Mr. Higginson's, but having been confronted countless times by the additions of Mr. Bonforte, one is not sure what is to be

deleted for sense. Is it a question asking a reason, or is the "Why" exclamatory? Is the tutor or the man being addressed? What is the object of the sentence? This is not an isolated example. Such occur at every hand. Mistakes such as "How it is then, . . . ?" for "How is it then, . . . ?" (p. 112) and "Here me discourse" for "Hear me discourse" (p. 79) are simply proof-reading errors and perhaps, therefore, excusable.

A look at the actual excerpts themselves multiplies the difficulties, since there is no way to know exactly where the selections were drawn from unless one knows chapter and verse by heart for every sentence in Higginson. Unfortunately, however, Higginson does not number verses or paragraphs, and Bonforte was not content with whole chapters. Instead, with shears he hacks his original into sentences or paragraphs and then stitches them together anew. To prove this required, besides the two volumes of Higginson, consultation of W. A. Oldfather's edition which contains the Greek, the English, and two formidable indices.

Two examples will demonstrate Mr. Bonforte's varied method and performance. The first, Chapter VI, is an ingenious weaving of related selections on the kinship of God and man. It consists of the following excerpts (cited fully to identify paragraphs as numbered in Oldfather's edition): II, viii, 13-17; Fragment CXV (Higginson); I, ix, 1-3; II, x, 4-5; and I, ix, 4. The effect is concise and, on the whole, quite successful. Here Mr. Bonforte is at his best. The second example, on the other hand, is of a much less understandable sort. This occurs in Chapters XXIV, XXV, and the opening of XXVI which occupy pages 27 through 29 in Mr. Bonforte's volume. The general theme is true and false friendship, and all the excerpts are drawn from Epictetus II, xxii. Chapter XXIV consists of paragraphs 9-12, 23, and 31; Chapter XXV of paragraphs 32-34, 13-14, part of 15-17, 19-21, 17-18, and part of 15. Chapter XXVI opens with paragraph 22. The reason for this sleight of hand escapes me completely, both as to the arrangement and chapter divisions, even granting the effect to be an improvement on Epictetus, which in my opinion it decidedly is not.

Mr. Bonforte's eagerness to share Epictetus with modern readers is not only commendable, but highly desirable. I concur heartily. "There is, however, a limit at which forbearance ceases to be a virtue." Thus saith Edmund Burke. *Caveat emptor!*

NATHAN DANE II

Bowdoin College

Die Griechische Tragödie. By MAX POHLENZ. Zweite neubearbeitete Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954. Vol. 1: pp. 501; Vol. 2 (notes): pp. 203.

PROFESSOR POHLENZ is one of the last surviving representatives of the old school of German classical scholarship. The first publication of his book on Greek tragedy in 1930 was one of the landmarks in this field. It has found its way into many American college libraries and it has been a companion to all those concerned with the teaching of Greek drama, whether in the original or in translation. It is a proof of the qualities of this work that it has been re-published after 24 years, a rare phenomenon among books of classical scholarship.

The author has re-written many passages as the result of his own continued research in Greek literature and of the considerable contributions made by scholars from many countries to a more profound understanding of some aspects of Greek tragedy. There are very few pages which do not present some change, either as a simple correction or addition, or with the reconsideration and rearrangement of an entire chapter, including the insertion of new material and new views. This change has been most significant in the sections on the general concept of the tragic and of tragedy, the pre-history of the drama, and the analysis of the philosophy and the interrelations of the three great tragic poets. The new papyrus finds are discussed, including the didascalic note *Or. Pap.* 2256 on the Danaid trilogy, which induces the author to agree with the assumption of its late performance (having been written, in his opinion, at an earlier stage of Aeschylus' career). The famous passage in Aristotle's definition is now interpreted as the purge "from this kind of emotions" instead of the first edition's "of this kind of emotions." A new emphasis on issues to which recent years have brought a new approach, such as character, guilt, freedom and necessity, is reflected in the new picture of Agamemnon, Ajax, Hippolytus, Hercules, and some other dramas. Pohlenz maintains his previous conviction of the priority of the Euripidean *Electra*. Due to the larger format and the smaller print, this second issue contains a considerable increase in text; and there are 50 pages of additional notes which have become necessary in order to discuss the large amount of recent research in Greek tragedy. Nearly every essential work on the subject has been considered by the author. There remain a few gaps in non-

German, especially American, publications due to the non-availability of foreign books and journals in the years after the war. In addition, Greek tragedy, as one of the most fundamental self-interpretations of man, has in the last decades been a major concern of classical scholarship as well as of the Humanities in general; in consequence, so much has been thought and published in this area that it is beyond the grasp of one mind to discuss and digest all of it.

If in some regards this work, which is the crowning of a scholarly career of nearly half a century, may be considered more a new book than a re-issue, it has kept all the sound and solid features of the original. The arrangement of the material and the general approach have not been changed. Although interest in the aesthetic side of the drama has grown, most readers will agree with Pohlenz' emphasis on the content and on the philosophy of the dramas and their authors, instead of on the externals of form and performance. After all, it is Greek tragedy as the embodiment of Greek thought about the philosophic, religious, and social issues of our existence, which is the main reason for our unflagging interest in this field. Some of Pohlenz' evaluations and references are rooted in German neo-classical humanism of the earlier part of the century and at variance with our own picture of the Hellenic world. But in general, both for perusal and for reference, his *Greek Tragedy* is the most welcome foreign complement to the many recent publications on this topic in English.

FELIX M. WASSERMANN

Kansas Wesleyan University

Index Verborum Ciceronis Poeticorum Fragmentorum. By JOHN WILLIAM SPAETH, JR. Based on the text of Aemilius Baehrens. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1955. Pp. x, 130. \$3.50.

PERHAPS NO LITERATURE is provided with lexica and indices more generously than Latin, and in Latin the works of Cicero—except most of his rhetorical works—have not been neglected. The index to his *Letters* by Oldfather, Cantor, and Abbott was a tremendous contribution. In their tradition and with the same general principles Spaeth has made this very welcome index of the poetic fragments. This was completed in 1939. Delay in publication because of the war and other factors has been unfortunate, especially since, as Spaeth points out in a Postscript, two "excellent critical editions of

the text" have meanwhile appeared and would have constituted a more satisfactory basis for this index. Production has been by the "photo-lith" process. The arrangement on the page in narrow columns, four columns to the page, has both advantages and disadvantages. The many occurrences of the commonest words, such as *a* and *ab*, are listed with only one reference for each line. This is far more convenient than the clustered paragraph of the usual printed index. In a noun or verb, however, where various forms are to be listed, the narrow column without indentation is somewhat awkward.

In an index as meticulously recorded as this, the presentation is necessarily complicated. For instance, in line 74 of Cicero's *De Consulatu Suo Garrod* in *The Oxford Book of Latin Verse* emended *fuderunt* to *sudarunt*. Spaeth lists *sudo*, *sudarunt* in double square brackets (which he uses to indicate that the word does not occur in the MSS.) with a reference to fragment 3. 74. Turning to his *Additamentum* under F 3. 74, one finds listed the fact that this is the emendation of Garrod. Under *fundo* in the index one finds *fuderunt* F 3. 74*. Here the asterisk advises the consultant that this word is noted in the *Additamentum*.

Scholars should be grateful to Professor Spaeth for the great amount of labor which he has expended on this useful work.

PHILIP WHALEY HARSH

Stanford University

The Ulysses Theme. By W. B. STANFORD.
Oxford: Blackwell, 1954. Pp. x. 292. 31/6.

THE ULYSSES THEME is an excellent analysis of the multifarious characterizations of Ulysses, their interpretation, symbolism, and interrelationships throughout European literature from Homer to Kazantzakis. The book synthesizes and unifies in a gratifying and stimulating fashion the author's penetrating "Studies in the Characterization of Ulysses," appearing since 1949 in *Hermaethena*.

Five of the sixteen chapters are devoted to Homer and the Epic Cycle, an apportionment of space justified by the general manner of treatment, as outlined below. Six chapters deal with other Greek and Roman writers, three with modern variations on the Ulysses theme, and two with certain aspects of mythological creativity. The book is carefully and unobtrusively documented with notes containing interesting leads to many peripheral matters. There is also a select bibliography, a general index (mainly proper names), and an index of Greek and Latin words discussed in the text.

Stanford ignores the Homeric Problem (simply assuming the Unitarian position), avoids entangling alliances with anthropological and psychological theories (for which he refers the reader elsewhere), and modestly limits himself to conservative, ethico-literary criticism. His study of the various literary portraits of Ulysses, which constitute the main content of the book, has led him to four convictions, which permeate his work.

First, he is convinced that the great proliferation and variation of the Ulysses theme in literature is due mainly to Homer's complete and complex conception of Odysseus, as revealed in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. In view of the excellent evidence amassed in support of this conclusion, no one is likely to undertake to refute it. In his elaboration of this idea, however, Stanford pays scant attention to the more general fact that the dynamic creativity inherent in Greek mythology, Homeric or otherwise, has resulted in many of the more prominent figures having a similar versatility and adaptability not only in literature but in other arts as well. (See, for example, Jean Seznec, *La Survivance des Dieux Antiques*, Studies of the Warburg Institute, vol. 11 [London, 1940]; English trans. *The Survival of the Pagan Gods* by Barbara F. Sessions [Pantheon, New York, 1953].)

Secondly, Stanford concludes that, in addition to historical, linguistic, literary, propagandist, moralistic, and other factors which have molded the Ulysses tradition, there is also, in certain cases, the effect of empathy, self-realization or self-identification, on the part of the writer in the process of creating his version of Ulysses. He uses this principle with due caution, but allows it to lead him to introduce an interesting, though relatively unimportant, discussion of some of Goethe's unfulfilled literary projects.

To the present reviewer (who, like Stanford himself, is content to leave explanations of such processes to professional psychologists), it is abundantly clear that Stanford, in the protracted and patient research required for such a painstaking piece of work, has himself developed something akin to an empathy for the Homeric Odysseus. His very language at times implies that for him this Odysseus exists as an almost palpable reality independent of the original artistic creation; Odysseus becomes for him, as he asserts he does for "authors and readers in every stage of the tradition . . . a personality as actual, in a sense, as Themistocles or Cicero." This

sympathetic sense of the actuality of Homer's Odysseus reinforces the more objective arguments for the third and fourth of his convictions, viz. that Homer's portrayal of Odysseus is by long odds esthetically the best, and that this Odysseus is ethically—or at least humanly—most admirable, being in fact “the Greekest of Greek heroes,” who “with a few lapses . . . observed the Delphic maxim of ‘Nothing in excess’ as faithfully as Socrates.”

It is therefore inconceivable for Stanford that, for example, the gentle and sensitive Vergil could willingly have vilified his master's “favourite hero.” The analysis given is designed to show that, although the esthetic exigencies of the pro-Trojan (pro-Roman) *Aeneid* required the denigration of Ulysses, Vergil carefully avoids personal assent to such heresy, by characterizing Ulysses indirectly through the lips of Aeneas and Sinon. But one must point out that, on the other hand, the glorification of Aeneas is largely achieved by similar indirect methods, and in any case the deeds of each, regardless of how recounted, speak—ethically, at least—for themselves, and the inevitable impression of Vergil's treatment of Ulysses, whatever his personal feelings in the matter and whatever the esthetic devices by which he presents him, is that Ulysses is to be regarded as a blackguard and a villain. Personal exoneration of Vergil is necessary only if one feels that he must vindicate both Vergil and the Homeric Odysseus.

Again, in dealing with Joyce's *Ulysses*, Stanford raises as “the main question for the present study” the problem whether or not Joyce's conception of Ulysses (Bloom) is “as well integrated and as *satisfying* [italics mine] as Homer's.” He clearly implies that it is, if one leaves aside “all prejudices about heroism, classicism, and romanticism.” Now if one can achieve such a feat, he may accept the conclusion, but only on one further condition, viz. that he also leave aside all prejudice against the Homeric Odysseus.

In his treatment of Vergil and Joyce and less noticeably elsewhere, Stanford's feeling for Odysseus seems to have blurred his otherwise highly objective view. But on the other hand, this same feeling is undoubtedly to a large extent responsible for the general excellence of the book. Unlike so many scholarly books, *The Ulysses Theme* has a very real and “satisfying” unity, which results from the fact that the writer posits his interpretation of the Homeric Odysseus (“Homer alone presented the whole man”) as the perfect prototype

LATIN STIMULI

● **STIMULATE** your Latin classes by entering them in the **THIRD ANNUAL LATIN EXAMINATION**. This examination will be administered in March and will be of the objective type so as to be more extensive. It will be offered on the first and second year level. *A separate test will be administered to first year students.* The enthusiasm engendered in preparation for this examination will amaze you. The difficult task of inciting students to review is one of the common problems of Latin teachers the country over. Administration of this competitive examination will, for the most part, solve that problem. Students love competition and since they are to be compared with students from all sections of the nation, many of them will do most of their reviewing outside of class, thereby saving you valuable class time. You will be able to determine the exact percentile ranking of each of your students on a national basis. A fee of \$.08 per student will be charged. *Write for free copy of last year's examination with key and norms.* Plaques, medals and certificates will be awarded to those students achieving a percentile ranking of 90 or higher.

● **VITALIZE** your Latin classes with dynamic tape recordings produced at leading educational institutions. Such dramatic productions as “The Odyssey” and “Cicero vs. Catiline” are included in this collection. A total of 27 stimulating programs with worksheets to go with most of the programs. *Service charge of \$.50 for all 15 minute programs.*

● **ANIMATE** your Latin classes with Latin Stimuli such as puzzles, games, charts, jokes, projects, activities, outline maps, grammar aids and interesting background material. *Over 30 different Latin aids. New aids developed each year.*

You need not remit for any of the above materials until you are completely satisfied with them and until you are sure that they can aid you in the teaching of Latin. *For a free detailed listing of the above materials send this ad to:*

DONALD R. HONZ, Latin Department
1902 Ogden Avenue, Superior 3, Wisconsin

against which all others are to be weighed and evaluated. This principle ties in with the judicious delimitation of the subject, as implied above, a subject which could easily tempt a writer into the re-examination of old literary problems and the exploration of many new theories in the social sciences. It also results in enhancing and enriching one's concept even of relatively minor works such as du Bellay's sonnet, *Heureux qui comme Ulysse* and Tennyson's *Ulysses*.

The book is not only a very real contribution to literary scholarship, but will also be found useful for classroom teaching. It throws light on many works commonly taught. Teachers can refer students to the book, confident that they will find it free from pedantry and eminently readable. For a course in mythology it is one of the few books available which illustrate the vast proliferation of mythological themes down to modern times. Indeed, for such a course, one could wish to see a whole series of similar books, each tracing the history of one of the important figures of mythology through the ages.

THOMAS CUTT

Wayne State University

the
ina-
the
be
test
asm
enze
is a
ntry
will,
com-
ents
do
ving
oline
on
be
ation
will
king

re-
Such
vs.
27
t of
nate

such
out-
ma-
oped

you
sure
free
to:

sin

ghed
with
t, as
asily
on of
ation
nces.
thing
minor
reux
sses.
ribu-
so be
t. It
only
o the
free
For
few
vast
down
urse.
es of
ry of
ology

UTY